IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BRENDON McPHERSON,1

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 9:12-CV-0766 (DNH/DEP)

٧.

SCOTT ROGERS,² et al.,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

OF COUNSEL:

FOR PLAINTIFF:

BRENDON McPHERSON, Pro Se 11-A-0823 Elmira Correctional Facility Elmira, NY 14902

While in his complaint plaintiff refers to himself as "Brendon" McPherson, according to publically available records maintained by the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, his first name is "Brendan." *Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, Inmate Population Information Search*, http://nysdoccslookup.doccs.ny.gov/ (last visited January 8, 2013). For the sake of consistency, I have left the docket sheet in this case undisturbed with respect to the spelling of plaintiff's name.

Plaintiff's complaint names the five defendants being sued as "Roger," "Gundrum," "Pluckrose," "Catlin," "Morris," and "Clark." <u>Dkt. No. 1 at 2-3</u>. Defendants' motion papers reveal that their full names are Scott Rogers, Matthew Gundrum, Shawn Pluckrose, Jerrad Catlin, Paul Morris, and Nina Clark. *See, e.g.,* <u>Dkt. No. 39-1 at 3</u>. Accordingly, the clerk is respectfully directed to revise the court's records to reflect the full names of those defendants.

FOR DEFENDANTS:

HON. ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN New York State Attorney General The Capitol Albany, NY 12224 KRISTIN M. QUARESIMO, ESQ. Assistant Attorney General

DAVID E. PEEBLES U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Pro se plaintiff Brendon McPherson, a New York State prison inmate, has commenced this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against six individuals employed at the prison facility in which he was confined at the relevant times, alleging the deprivation of his civil rights. In his complaint, plaintiff alleges that he was assaulted by a corrections officer, and that, in retaliation for filing a grievance concerning that incident, he was attacked by several other corrections employees, issued a misbehavior report resulting in disciplinary confinement in the prison's special housing unit ("SHU"), and denied medical treatment for his injuries.

Now that discovery is closed, defendants have moved for the entry of summary judgment dismissing plaintiff's complaint in its entirety based on a variety of grounds. For the reasons set forth below, I recommend that the motion be granted in part and denied in part, and that plaintiff's medical indifference claims be dismissed, but that his excessive force and

retaliation causes of action survive the motion in light of the existence of triable issues of material fact.

I. BACKGROUND³

Plaintiff is an inmate currently held in the custody of New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision ("DOCCS"). See generally Dkt. No. 1. At all times relevant to this action, he was incarcerated at the Coxsackie Correctional Facility, located in Coxsackie, New York. *Id.*

On the evening of August 3, 2011, plaintiff was stopped by defendant Scott Rogers, a corrections officer at Coxsackie, and told to empty his pockets. Dkt. No. 1 at 7. According to plaintiff, defendant

Much of the following recitation is derived from defendants' statement of undisputed material facts, submitted pursuant to rule 7.1(a)(3) of the local rules of practice for this court. Dkt. No. 41-1. While defendants' motion did not include the required notice to plaintiff, as a pro se party, concerning the consequences of failing to properly respond to the summary judgment motion, and in particular defendants' statement of undisputed material facts, a copy of that notice was forwarded by the court to the plaintiff on May 1, 2013. Dkt. No. 40. Despite that notice, plaintiff's opposition to the defendants' motion did not include a responsive statement of undisputed material facts in accordance with the local rules. See generally Dkt. No. 45. Accordingly, the facts set forth in defendants' statement, to the extent they are supported by the record, are deemed to have been admitted by the plaintiff for purposes of the pending motion. See N.D.N.Y. L.R. 7.1(a)(3) ("The Court shall deem admitted any properly supported facts set forth in the Statement of Material Facts that the opposing party does not specifically controvert."); see also Ketchuck v. Boyer, 10-CV-0870, 2011 WL 5080404, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 25, 2011) (McAvoy, J.) ("The responding Statement of Material Facts is not a mere formality, and the courts apply this rule strictly." (listing cases)). The remaining facts discussed in this section are derived from the record now before the court, with all inferences drawn and ambiguities resolved in plaintiff's favor. Terry v. Ashcroft, 336 F.3d 128, 137 (2d Cir. 2003).

Rogers confiscated his prisoner identification, and then stated, "'I kill [sic] you the next time you disrespect me.'" *Id.* Later that day, plaintiff was isolated from other inmates and assaulted by defendant Rogers, who began yelling at him, slapped him in the face, and administered several body punches. *Id.*

As a result of that incident, plaintiff suffered swelling in his torso, but reported that he did not feel any pain or injuries the next day. Dkt. No. 39-7 at 30. He did not seek medical treatment for any injury until August 9, 2011. *Id.*; Dkt. No. 39-22 at 21. Plaintiff's medical records from that date reveal that, despite complaints of rib pain, no visible injuries, swelling, or chest expansion were observed. Dkt. No. 39-22 at 21.

Following the incident, defendant Rogers threatened the plaintiff and informed him that if he filed a grievance "it going to be more too [sic] it."

Dkt. No. 39-7 at 12, 19. Despite that admonition, plaintiff filed a grievance concerning the incident on August 8, 2011. Dkt. No. 41-1 at 1; Dkt. No. 39-15; Dkt. No. 39-18 at 6-7. That grievance was pursued to completion through appeal to the DOCCS Central Office Review Committee ("CORC"). Dkt. No. 39-18 at 2.

On August 25, 2011, plaintiff was directed by defendant Matthew Gundrum, another corrections officer at Coxsackie, to dress and proceed

to the recreation area. Dkt. No. 1 at 8; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1. After arriving there, defendant Gundrum allegedly asked plaintiff if he enjoyed filing grievances against officers, and then told plaintiff "he [was] going to give [plaintiff] something to file a grievance about." Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1. According to plaintiff, defendant Gundrum removed his hat, emptied his pockets, approached plaintiff, and instructed him to assume a fighting stance. Dkt. No. 1 at 8. Gundrum then allegedly attacked plaintiff. Id.; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1. At some point during the altercation, defendants Jerrad Catlin and Shawn Pluckrose, two other corrections officers, as well as defendant Paul Morris, a corrections sergeant, became involved. Dkt. No. 1 at 8; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1-2, 15. While defendant Gundrum kneeled on plaintiff's back, defendant Pluckrose pressed his foot onto plaintiff's cheek and defendant Catlin placed plaintiff in restraints. Dkt. No. 1 at 8; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 7. Plaintiff was then removed to a location where no other inmates could watch, and the assault continued, with defendants punching him in the stomach and one of defendants kicking him in the testicles and pushing his head into the wall. Dkt. No. 39-8 at 7-15. According to the plaintiff, during the assaults he was struck "all over" including on his chest, stomach, and back. Id. at 14.

Following that use-of-force incident on August 25, 2011, plaintiff was

escorted to the Coxsackie medical clinic for evaluation and treatment.

Dkt. No. 1 at 8; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 16-17. There, he was seen by defendant

Nina Clark, a nurse employed at the facility. Dkt. No. 39-8 at 18.

According to plaintiff's medical records, while at the clinic, he complained of injuries to his right upper outer cheek area and testicles. Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. Based upon her examination, the only injury observed by defendant Clark on that occasion was a "small dot of possible swelling over [plaintiff's] right cheek bone." *Id.* Defendant Clark did not observe any discoloration or swelling on or near the left side of plaintiff's left testicle. *Id.*

According to plaintiff's medical records, during the nurse's examination, the range of motion of plaintiff's jaw and extremities was found to be normal, he did not grimace while opening his mouth, and he did not have any difficulty talking or sticking out his tongue. Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. Similarly, plaintiff's medical records reflect that, upon examination, his oral cavity was intact, no injuries were observed on his mouth or lips, and he was able to walk without a limp or injury. *Id.* Following the examination, plaintiff was given a cold compress and advised to follow-up with a sick call if needed.⁴ *Id.*

Although plaintiff's medical records reveal that blood was drawn from him on August 30, and again on September 8, 2011, notes from those occasions do not reflect that they were prompted by any complaints from plaintiff regarding his injuries

As a result of the incident on August 25, 2011, plaintiff was issued an inmate misbehavior report authored by defendant Gundrum, charging him with assaulting staff members, refusing to comply with a direct order, and creating a disturbance. Dkt. No. 39-11 at 7. A Tier III disciplinary hearing was conducted in connection with that misbehavior report on September 14, 2011.⁵ *Id.* at 5. At the conclusion of the hearing, plaintiff was found guilty of all three counts and was sentenced to a period of disciplinary SHU confinement of twelve months, with a corresponding loss of packages, commissary, and telephone privileges, and with a further recommendation that he forfeit good time credits. *Id.* at 4. That penalty was subsequently reduced on appeal to a six-month period of disciplinary confinement and a nine-month loss of privileges. *Id.* at 2.

There is conflicting evidence in the record regarding whether plaintiff

stemming from the incident August 25, 2011. See Dkt. No. 39-23 at 19-20. Instead, it appears that the next date on which plaintiff was treated by medical personnel at Coxsackie at plaintiff's request was September 20, 2011, at which time plaintiff complained of lower back pain and dry skin. Id. at 18.

The DOCCS conducts three types of inmate disciplinary hearings. See 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 270.3; see also Hynes v. Squillace, 143 F.3d 653, 655 n.1 (2d Cir. 1998). Tier I hearings address the least serious infractions and can result in minor punishments such as the loss of recreation privileges. Hynes, 143 F.3d 655 n.1. Tier II hearings involve more serious infractions, and can result in penalties which include confinement for a period of time in the SHU. *Id.* Tier III hearings address the most serious violations and can result in unlimited SHU confinement and the loss of "good time" credits. Id.

filed a grievance regarding the use-of-force incident on August 25, 2011, or the subsequent allegedly inadequate medical treatment. For example, plaintiff testified at his deposition that he filed a grievance regarding the events surrounding the incident on August 25 a couple of days following the alleged assault while in the Coxsackie SHU. See Dkt. No. 39-8 at 25 ("Q: Did you file a grievance about the 8/25 incident? A: Yes, ma'am. Q: When did you file that grievance? A: A couple of days I was in the box I filed a grievance. A couple of days I was in the box I filed a grievance about the incident."). It appears from the record now before the court, however, that the grievance to which plaintiff referred at his deposition is the letter he wrote to the New York State DOCCS Inspector General, rather than a formal grievance through the Inmate Grievance Procedure ("IGP").6 See id.; Dkt. No. 39-20. It is undisputed, however, that plaintiff filed a formal grievance through the IGP regarding the incident on August 3, 2011, involving defendant Rogers. Dkt. No. 39-7 at 21; Dkt. No. 39-15; Dkt. No. 39-17.

The IGP will be explained more fully below in part III.B. of this report.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced this action on May 9, 2012. Dkt. No. 1. Named as defendants in his complaint are Corrections Officers Scott Rogers, Matthew Gundrum, Shawn Pluckrose, and Jerrad Catlin; Corrections Sergeant Paul Morris; and Nurse Nina Clark. *Id.* at 2-3. Plaintiff's complaint asserts three causes of action alleging (1) the use of excessive force, in violation of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution, against defendants Rogers, Gundrum, Pluckrose, Catlin, and Morris; (2) deliberate medical indifference, in violation of the Eighth Amendment, against defendant Clark; and (3) the issuance of a false misbehavior report claim, in violation of the Eighth Amendment, against defendant Gundrum. Id. at 5. In addition, mindful of my obligation to liberally construe a pro se prisoner's pleading, Sealed Plaintiff v. Sealed Defendant, 537 F.3d 185, 191 (2d Cir. 2008), I have construed plaintiff's complaint to also assert a retaliation claim under the First Amendment against defendant Gundrum. Dkt. No. 1 at 6. Plaintiff seeks recovery of damages in the amount of \$5 million. *Id.* at 5-6.

On May 1, 2013, following the close of discovery, defendants moved for the entry of summary judgment dismissing plaintiff's complaint on several grounds. Dkt. No. 39. In their motion, defendants argue that (1)

plaintiff's claims regarding the incident on August 25, 2011, and subsequent alleged failure to provide adequate medical treatment are subject to dismissal based upon his failure to file, and pursue to completion, a grievance concerning those matters; (2) plaintiff's claims of excessive force arising out of both incidents occurring in August 2011 lack merit as a matter of law; (3) plaintiff's claim against defendant Clark for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need fails to meet the objective and subjective criteria associated with such a claim; and (4) plaintiff's claim against defendant Gundrum for filing a false misbehavior report is precluded by the unfavorable results of the ensuing disciplinary hearing. *Id.* Plaintiff has since responded in opposition to defendants' motion. Dkt. No. 45.

Defendants' motion, which is now fully briefed and ripe for determination, has been referred to me for the issuance of a report and recommendation, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Northern District of New York Local Rule 72.3(c). See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

III. <u>DISCUSSION</u>

A. Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment motions are governed by Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Under that provision, the entry of summary judgment is warranted "if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material facts and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a); see Caltex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986); Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1986); Sec. Ins. Co. of Hartford v. Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., 391 F.3d 77, 82-83 (2d Cir. 2004). A fact is "material" for purposes of this inquiry, if it "might affect the outcome of the suit under the governing law." Anderson, 477 U.S. at 248; accord, Jeffreys v. City of New York, 426 F.3d 549, 553 (2d Cir. 2005). A material fact is genuinely in dispute "if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248.

A party moving for summary judgment bears an initial burden of demonstrating that there is no genuine dispute of material fact to be decided with respect to any essential element of the claim in issue, and the failure to meet this burden warrants denial of the motion. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 250 n.4; *Sec. Ins. Co. of Hartford*, 391 F.3d at 83. In the event

this initial burden is met, the opposing party must show, through affidavits or otherwise, that there is a material dispute of fact for trial. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e); *Caltex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 324; *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 250.

When deciding a summary judgment motion, a court must resolve any ambiguities, and draw all inferences, in a light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Jeffreys*, 426 F.3d at 553; *Wright v. Coughlin*, 132 F.3d 133, 137-38 (2d Cir. 1998). The entry of summary judgment is justified only in the event of a finding that no reasonable trier of fact could rule in favor of the non-moving party. *Bldg. Trades Employers' Educ. Ass'n v. McGowan*, 311 F.3d 501, 507-08 (2d Cir. 2002); *see also Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 250 (finding summary judgment appropriate only when "there can be but one reasonable conclusion as to the verdict").

B. <u>Failure to Exhaust</u>

In support their motion, defendants concede that plaintiff properly exhausted administrative remedies concerning the use-of-force incident involving defendant Rogers on August 3, 2011, before commencing suit.

Dkt. No. 39-1 at 12. They maintain, however, that, by virtue of his failure to file a grievance concerning the alleged assault by defendants Gundrum, Morris, Catlin, and Pluckrose on August 25, 2011, the subsequent alleged failure to provide proper medical treatment for his injuries by defendant

Clark, and the allegedly retaliatory issuance of a false misbehavior report by defendant Gundrum, plaintiff cannot now pursue those claims in this action. *Id.* at 8-15.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996 ("PLRA"), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996), which imposes several restrictions on the ability of prisoners to maintain federal civil rights actions, expressly requires that "[n]o action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a); see also Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 84 (2006) ("Exhaustion" is . . . mandatory. Prisoners must now exhaust all 'available' remedies[.]"); Hargrove v. Riley, No. 04-CV-4587, 2007 WL 389003, at *5-6 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2007) ("The exhaustion requirement is a mandatory condition precedent to any suit challenging prison conditions, including suits brought under Section 1983."). Tighe PLRA's exhaustion requirement applies to all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege excessive force or some other wrong." *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002).

All unreported decisions cited to in this report have been appended for the convenience of the *pro* se plaintiff.

In the event the defendant establishes that the inmate plaintiff failed "to fully complete[] the administrative review process" prior to commencing the action, the plaintiff's complaint is subject to dismissal. *Pettus v. McCoy*, No. 04-CV-0471, 2006 WL 2639369, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 13, 2006) (McAvoy, J.); *see also Woodford*, 548 U.S. at 93 ("[W]e are persuaded that the PLRA exhaustion requirement requires proper exhaustion."). "Proper exhaustion" requires a plaintiff to procedurally exhaust his claims by "compl[ying] with the system's critical procedural rules." *Woodford*, 548 U.S. at 95; *see also Macias v. Zenk*, 495 F.3d 37, 43 (2d Cir. 2007) (citing *Woodford*).8

In accordance with the PLRA, the DOCCS has implemented a grievance procedure, called the Inmate Grievance Program ("IGP"), which is available to inmates. The IGP comprised of three steps that inmates must satisfy when they have a grievance regarding prison conditions. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.5; *Mingues v. Nelson*, No. 96-CV-5396, 2004 WL 234898, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 20, 2004). Embodied in 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701, the IGP requires that an inmate first file a complaint with the facility's IGP

While placing prison officials on notice of a grievance through less formal channels may constitute claim exhaustion "in a substantive sense," an inmate plaintiff nonetheless must meet the procedural requirement of exhausting his available administrative remedies within the appropriate grievance construct in order to satisfy the PLRA. *Macias*, 495 F.3d at 43 (quoting *Johnson v. Testman*, 380 F.3d 691, 697-98 (2d Cir. 2004) (emphasis omitted)).

clerk within twenty-one days of the alleged occurrence. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.5(a)(1). If a grievance complaint form is not readily available, a complaint may be submitted on plain paper. *Id.* A representative of the facility's inmate grievance resolution committee ("IGRC") has up to sixteen days after the grievance is filed to informally resolve the issue. *Id.* at § 701.5(b)(1). If there is no such informal resolution, then the full IGRC conducts a hearing within sixteen days after receipt of the grievance. *Id.* at § 701.5(b)(2).

A grievant may then appeal the IGRC's decision to the facility's superintendent within seven days after receipt of the IGRC's written decision. *Id.* at § 701.5(c). The superintendent must issue a written decision within a certain number of days of receipt of the grievant's appeal.⁹ *Id.* at § 701.5(c)(i), (ii).

The third and final step of the IGP involves an appeal to the CORC, which must be taken within seven days after receipt of the superintendent's written decision. *Id.* at § 701.5(d)(1)(i). The CORC is required to render a written decision within thirty days of receipt of the appeal. *Id.* at § 701.5(d)(2)(i).

Depending on the type of matter complained of by the grievant, the superintendent has either seven or twenty days after receipt of the grievant's appeal to issue a decision. *Id.* at § 701.5(c)(i), (ii).

Accordingly, at each step of the IGP process, a decision must be entered within a specified time period. Significantly, "[a]ny failure by the IGRC or the superintendent to timely respond to a grievance or first-level appeal, respectively, can – and must – be appealed to the next level, including CORC, to complete the grievance process." Murray v. Palmer, No. 03-CV-1010, 2010 WL 1235591, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2010) (Hurd, J., adopting report and recommendation by Lowe, M.J.) (citing, inter alia, 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.6(g)(2)). Generally, if a plaintiff fails to follow each of the required three steps of the above-described procedure prior to commencing litigation, he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. See Ruggerio v. Cnty. of Orange, 467 F.3d 170, 176 (2d Cir. 2006) ("[T]he PLRA requires proper exhaustion, which means using all steps that the agency holds out, and doing so *properly* (so that the agency addresses the issues on the merits)." (quotation marks omitted)).

In this case, although plaintiff testified at his deposition that he filed a grievance regarding the events surrounding the incident on August 25, 2011, Dkt. No. 39-8 at 25, I find that the "grievance" to which this testimony refers is the letter written by him to the New York State DOCCS Inspector General ("Inspector General") on August 29, 2011. Edward Killar, the Coxsackie Inmate Grievance Program Supervisor, submitted a

declaration in support of defendants' motion, in which he avers that, during plaintiff's incarceration at Coxsackie, he filed only one grievance through the IGP. Dkt. No. 39-14 at 2. Similarly, Karen Bellamy, the DOCCS IGP Director, attests in her declaration that, according to records maintained by the DOCCS, plaintiff never filed a grievance appeal to the CORC, in accordance with the IGP, regarding allegations of excessive force, retaliation, the issuance of a false misbehavior report, or inadequate medical care while he was confined at Coxsackie. Dkt. No. 39-16 at 2. There is evidence in the record, however, that plaintiff sent a letter to the Inspector General, dated August 29, 2011, complaining of an assault by Coxsackie correctional officers on August 3, and August 25, 2011. Dkt. No. 39-19 at 1-2; Dkt. No. 39-20. Because there is no record evidence, aside from plaintiff's nebulous testimony at his deposition, that he filed a grievance regarding the events surrounding the incident on August 25, 2011, I conclude that he only filed a letter with the Inspector General, rather than a formal grievance through the IGP, concerning the matter.

The allegations contained in plaintiff's letter to the Inspector General were investigated by the Office of the Inspector General. Dkt. No. 39-19
at 2. Investigator Doherty conducted an investigation "consist[ing] of interviews and a review of documents, medical records, and photographs."

Id. Following the investigation, Doherty submitted a report to Kellar "concluding that the allegations [in plaintiff's letter] were unsubstantiated and recommend[ing] that the case be closed." Id. Subsequently, Kellar reviewed the investigation results and closed the case as unsubstantiated on January 10, 2012. Id. According to Bellamy, plaintiff did not appeal this decision to the CORC. Dkt. No. 39-16 at 2.

Courts in this circuit have routinely held that

there is no exhaustion where an inmate complains directly to the Inspector General (i.e., instead of complaining to the superintendent and having the complaint referred to the Inspector General pursuant to 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.8(d)), the Inspector General renders a finding of unsubstantiation, and the inmate fails to appeal that finding to the CORC.

Smith v. Kelly, -- F. Supp. 2d ----, No. 06-CV-0505, 2013 WL 6154366, at *5 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 30, 2013) (Suddaby, J.) (footnote omitted) (collecting cases). Accordingly, I conclude that plaintiff did not exhaust his administrative remedies by merely filing a letter with the Inspector General regarding the events surrounding or following the use-of-force incident on August 25, 2011.

Plaintiff's failure to exhaust, however, does not warrant dismissal of his complaint without further inquiry. In a series of decisions rendered since enactment of the PLRA, the Second Circuit has prescribed a three-

part test for determining whether dismissal of an inmate plaintiff's complaint is warranted for failure to satisfy the PLRA's exhaustion requirement. See, e.g., Hemphill v. New York, 380 F.3d 680, 686 (2d Cir. 2004); see also Macias, 495 F.3d at 41. Those decisions instruct that, before dismissing an action as a result of a plaintiff's failure to exhaust, a court must first determine whether the administrative remedies were available to the plaintiff at the relevant times. *Macias*, 495 F.3d at 41; Hemphill, 380 F.3d at 686. In the event of a finding that a remedy existed and was available, the court must next examine whether the defendant has forfeited the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to properly raise or preserve it, or whether, through his own actions preventing the exhaustion of plaintiff's remedies, he should be estopped from asserting failure to exhaust as a defense. *Id.* In the event the exhaustion defense survives these first two levels of scrutiny, the court must examine whether the plaintiff has plausibly alleged special circumstances to justify his failure to comply with the applicable administrative procedure requirements. *Id.*

Because plaintiff has not argued that the IGP was unavailable to him during the times relevant to this action, or that special circumstances exist that would justify his failure to exhaust the available administrative

remedies regarding his claims arising from the incidents occurring on and after August 25, 2011, I have analyzed only whether plaintiff has established that defendants are estopped from asserting the exhaustion defense. Plaintiff attributes his failure to file a grievance in accordance with the IGP to his fear of retaliation against him by defendants. Dkt. No. 45 at 3, 5-6. He contends that his belief in that regard was reasonable based upon the fact that defendant Gundrum allegedly told him, immediately before using force against him, that Gundrum was about to give him something to grieve. *Id.* at 6; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1. Moreover, at his deposition, plaintiff testified that defendant Rogers allegedly threatened to assault him again if he filed a grievance against Rogers regarding the use of force on August 3, 2011. Dkt. No. 39-8 at 12, 19. Plaintiff maintains that defendants Gundrum, Catlin, Pluckrose, and Morris used force against him on August 25, 2011, in retaliation for his grievance filed regarding the incident earlier that month, and, in light of plaintiff's perception that defendant Gundrum carried out the threats made by him and defendant Rogers, plaintiff chose not to file a grievance through the IGP against the defendants involved in the incident on August 25. Id. Instead, under the circumstances, plaintiff followed what he perceived to be a safer course by complaining in writing to the Inspector General. *Id.*

Based upon the record now before the court, I cannot recommend dismissal of plaintiff's claims arising out of the incident on August 25, 2011, based on a failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The court is not in a position to evaluate the plausibility of plaintiff's perceived fears of retaliation by defendants. If it is true that defendant Roger warned plaintiff not to file a grievance related to the incident on August 3, 2011, and it is true that defendant Gundrum preceded his alleged use of force against plaintiff with a warning about filing grievances in general, it is conceivable that the incident on August 25, 2011 gave plaintiff the impression that defendants would continue to attack him if he filed any further grievances. On the other hand, plaintiff's credibility regarding the perceived threat from defendants is called into question by the fact that he filed a letter complaint with the Inspector General. While plaintiff describes this action as "safer" than filing a grievance in accordance with the IGP, he fails to explain how a letter to the Inspector General carries less risk than a grievance through the IGP. Moreover, plaintiff filed this lawsuit against the defendants who allegedly threatened and assaulted him in response to his filing of a grievance against defendant Rogers. Such conduct seemingly belies plaintiff's insistence that he feared retaliation by defendants. Because I am not in a position to render credibility determinations at this juncture,

however, I recommend that defendants' motion for summary judgment based on exhaustion of administrative remedies be denied without prejudce, and that the court hold an evidentiary hearing pursuant to *Messa v. Goord*, 652 F.3d 305 (2d Cir. 2011), to determine whether defendants should be estopped from asserting failure to exhaust as a defense.

C. <u>Excessive Force Claims</u>

Turning to the merits of plaintiff's claims, defendants assert that the excessive force causes of action stemming from the events on August 3 and 25, 2011, are subject to dismissal based upon the *de minimis* nature of the force allegedly applied and the resulting injuries sustained. Dkt. No. 39-1 at 15.

Plaintiff's excessive-force claim is grounded in the Eighth

Amendment. A plaintiff's constitutional right against cruel and unusual
punishment is violated by an "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain."

Whitley v. Albers, 475 U.S. 312, 319 (quotation marks omitted); Griffin v.

Crippen, 193 F.3d 89, 91 (2d Cir. 1999). "A claim of cruel and unusual
punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment has two components –
one subjective, focusing on the defendant's motive for his conduct, and the
other objective, focusing on the conduct's effect." Wright v. Goord, 554

F.3d 255, 268 (2d Cir. 2009) (citing Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 7-8

(1992); *Blyden v. Mancusi*, 186 F.3d 252, 262 (2d Cir. 1999)). To satisfy the subjective requirement in an excessive force case, the plaintiff must demonstrate that "the defendant had the necessary level of culpability, shown by actions characterized by wantonness in light of the particular circumstances surrounding the challenged conduct." Wright, 554 F.3d at 268 (quotation marks omitted). This inquiry turns on "whether force was applied in a good faith effort to maintain or restore discipline or maliciously and sadistically for the very purpose of causing harm." Hudson, 503 U.S. at 6 (quotation marks omitted); accord, Blyden, 186 F.3d at 262. The Supreme Court has emphasized that the nature of the force applied is the "core judicial inquiry" in excessive force cases – not "whether a certain quantum of injury was sustained." Wilkins v. Gaddy, 559 U.S. 34, 37 (2010) (per curiam). Accordingly, when considering the subjective element of the governing Eighth Amendment test, a court must be mindful that the absence of serious injury, though relevant, does not necessarily negate a finding of wantonness. Wilkins, 559 U.S. at 37; Hudson, 503 U.S. at 9.

Additionally, courts must bear in mind that "[n]ot every push or shove, even if it later may seem unnecessary in the peace of a judge's chambers, violates a prisoner's constitutional rights." *Romano v. Howarth*,

998 F.2d 101, 105 (2d Cir. 1993) (quotation marks omitted); see also *Griffin*, 193 F.3d at 91. "The Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishments necessarily excludes from constitutional recognition *de minimis* uses of physical force, provided that the use of force is not of a sort repugnant to the conscience of mankind." *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 9-10 (quotation marks omitted).

"The objective component [of the excessive force analysis] . . . focuses on the harm done, in light of 'contemporary standards of decency." Wright, 554 F.3d at 268 (quoting Hudson, 503 U.S. at 8); see also Blyden, 186 F.3d at 263 (finding the objective component "context specific, turning upon 'contemporary standards of decency'"). In assessing this component, a court must ask whether the alleged wrongdoing is objectively harmful enough to establish a constitutional violation. Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 303 (1991); accord Hudson, 503 U.S. at 8; see also Wright, 554 F.3d at 268. "But when prison officials use force to cause harm maliciously and sadistically, 'contemporary standards' of decency always are violated. This is true whether or not significant injury is evident." Wright, 554 F.3d at 268-69 (quoting Hudson, 503 U.S. at 9) (alterations omitted)). The extent of an inmate's injury is but one of the factors to be considered in determining whether a prison official's use

of force was "unnecessary and wanton" because "injury and force . . . are imperfectly correlated[.]" *Wilkins*, 559 U.S. at 38. In addition, courts consider the need for force, whether the force was proportionate to the need, the threat reasonably perceived by the officials, and what, if anything, the officials did to limit their use of force. *Hudson*, 503 U.S. at 7; *Whitley*, 475 U.S. at 321; *Romano*, 998 F.2d at 105.

Finally, on a motion for summary judgment, where the record evidence could reasonably permit a rational factfinder to find that corrections officers used force maliciously and sadistically, dismissal of an excessive force claim is inappropriate. *Wright*, 554 F.3d at 269 (citing *Scott v. Coughlin*, 344 F.3d 282, 291 (2d Cir. 2003) (reversing summary dismissal the plaintiff's complaint, though suggesting that prisoner's evidence of an Eighth Amendment violation was "thin" as to his claim that a corrections officer struck him in the head, neck, shoulder, wrist, abdomen, and groin, where the "medical records after the . . . incident with [that officer] indicated only a slight injury")).

In this case, if plaintiff's allegations concerning the uses of force by defendants against him are credited, a reasonable factfinder could conclude that hiss Eighth Amendment rights were violated. With regard to the subjective element, plaintiff's complaint and deposition testimony

suggest that defendants used force against him for reasons unrelated to restoring or maintaining discipline. On August 3, 2011, defendant Rogers allegedly used force against plaintiff because he thought plaintiff directed a disrespectful noise at him. See, e.g., Dkt. No. 39-7 at 11-12. Plaintiff, however, denies making any such noise. *Id.* at 13-14. In addition, plaintiff alleges that defendant Gundrum attacked him on August 25, 2011, in retaliation for filing a grievance against defendant Rogers in connection with the use-of-force incident on August 3, 2011. See Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1 ("Officer Gundrum was running showers at the time and I came up for the shower. When I reached the shower entrance he told me to go back in and get dressed. So I went back in and go dressed and he told me to meet him in the recreation area. When I went there he asked me if I like filing grievances on officers and he going to give me something to file a grievance about."). All of this evidence, if credited by a factfinder, would be sufficient to establish the subjective element of plaintiff's excessive force claim.

Turning to the objective element, I find that there is a dispute of fact regarding whether defendants' alleged conduct was sufficiently serious to give rise to an Eighth Amendment claim. Plaintiff testified that his torso was swollen and he felt some pain on the night of August 3, 2011 as a

result of the alleged assault by defendant Rogers. Dkt. No. 39-7 at 29-30. Moreover, although plaintiff did not immediately seek medical treatment, his medical records demonstrate that he eventually sought intervention on August 9, 2011. Dkt. No. 39-22 at 21. Immediately following the use-offorce incident on August 25, 2011, plaintiff was examined by medical staff at Coxsackie. Dkt. No. 1 at 8; Dkt. No. 39-8 at 16-17. At that time, plaintiff complained of injuries to his right upper outer cheek area and testicles. Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. Although none of plaintiff's medical records reveal that plaintiff suffered anything but minimal injuries as a result of the alleged uses of force by the defendants, I am reminded that "even de *minimis* uses of force are unconstitutional if they are 'repugnant to the conscience of mankind." Walsh, 194 F.3d at 50 (quoting Hudson, 503 U.S. at 10)); see also Wilkins, 559 U.S. at 38 (finding that the extent of an inmate's injuries is but one factor to consider in determining whether a defendant's use of force was "unnecessary and wanton" because "injury and force . . . are imperfectly correlated"). In the event that a factfinder credits plaintiff's version of the events on August 3 and 25, 2011, it would be possible to find that defendants' conduct, as alleged, was sufficient to violate plaintiff's constitutional rights.

In light of the genuine disputes of material fact surrounding the

incidents on August 3 and 25, 2011, I recommend that defendants' motion for summary judgment regarding plaintiff's excessive force claims be denied.

D. Jeffreys Exception

While acknowledging that resolution of plaintiff's claims involving the use-of-force incident on August 3, 2011, require the court to make a credibility determination between the divergent assessments of events offered by the parties, defendants nonetheless ask the court to invoke the narrow exception recognized in *Jeffreys*, and resolve that credibility dispute against the plaintiff. Dkt. No. 39-1 at 16-17. In support of that request, defendants contend that "there is absolutely no evidence in [the] record that this alleged assault ever happened." Dkt. No. 39-1 at 16.

On a motion for summary judgment, where the record evidence, including a inmate-plaintiff's allegations, if credited, could reasonably permit a rational factfinder to conclude that a defendant-corrections officer used force maliciously and sadistically, it is inappropriate for the court to dismiss an excessive force claim. *Wright*, 554 F.3d at 269 (citing *Scott v. Coughlin*, 344 F.3d 282, 291 (2d Cir.2003); *Griffin v. Crippen*, 193 F.3d 89, 91 (2d Cir. 1999)); see also Rule v. Brine, Inc., 85 F.3d 1002, 1011 (2d Cir.1996) ("Assessments of credibility and choices between conflicting

versions of the events are matters for the jury, not for the court on summary judgment."). The Second Circuit, however, recognized a narrow exception to this general rule in *Jeffreys*. In that case, the Second Circuit held that summary judgment may be awarded in the rare circumstance where there is nothing in the record to support the plaintiff's allegations of the defendants' use of excessive force, aside from his own contradictory and incomplete testimony, and, even after drawing all inferences in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, the court determines that "no reasonable person" could credit his testimony. *Jeffreys*, 426 F.3d at 54-55.

To apply the *Jeffreys* exception, a defendant must satisfy the following three requirements: (1) "the plaintiff must rely 'almost exclusively on his own testimony,'" (2) the plaintiff's "testimony must be 'contradictory or incomplete,'" and (3) the plaintiff's testimony must be contradicted by evidence produced by the defense. *Benitez v. Ham*, No. 04-CV-1159, 2009 WL 3486379, at *20-21 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 21, 2009) (Mordue, J., *adopting report and recommendation by* Lowe, M.J.) (quoting *Jeffreys*, 426 F.3d at 554).

Having carefully reviewed the record now before the court, I am unable to recommend summary rejection of plaintiff's account regarding

the events of August 3, 2011. While it is true that plaintiff did not seek medical attention for the injuries suffered as a result of that incident until six days later, on August 9, 2011, and there did not appear to be any objective sign of injury at the time, as was previously noted, the lack of an injury does not necessarily negate a finding of the use of excessive force. Wilkins, 559 U.S. at 38; Walsh, 194 F.3d at 50. Moreover, while there may be minor inconsistencies concerning the incident between plaintiff's complaint and his deposition testimony, they are not so starkly contradictory as to warrant invocation of the narrow *Jeffreys* exception to the well-established rule that the court may not assess credibility on a motion for summary judgment. Finally, I note that, while plaintiff has stated under oath, on more than one occasion, that defendant Rogers assaulted him, the record does not contain any similar, sworn statement from defendant Rogers denying that the incident occurred. On this basis, I recommend against dismissal of plaintiff's excessive force claims pursuant to the Second Circuit's decision in *Jeffreys*.

There is evidence in the record, however, reflecting that defendant Roger denies utilizing force against the plaintiff on that occasion. <u>Dkt. No. 39-18 at 10</u>.

E. Deliberate Medical Indifference Claim

Defendant Clark, a prison nurse stationed at Coxsackie during the times relevant to this action, seeks dismissal of plaintiff's deliberate medical indifference claim asserted against her. Dkt. No. 39-1 at 21-24. This cause of action arises from plaintiff's allegation that defendant Clark provided him with inadequate medical treatment following the use-of-force incident on August 25, 2011. Dkt. No. 1 at 8.

Plaintiff's medical indifference claim also arises under the Eighth Amendment, which prohibits punishment that is "incompatible with 'the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society[,]' or which 'involve the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain[.]" *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 102-03 (1976) (quoting *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86, 100-01 (1958) and *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 169-73 (1976) (citations omitted)). While the Eighth Amendment "'does not mandate comfortable prisons,' neither does it permit inhumane ones." *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832 (1994) (quoting *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 349 (1981)).

"These elementary principles establish the government's obligation to provide medical care for those whom it is punishing by incarceration." *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 103. Failure to provide inmates with medical care,

"[i]n the worst cases, . . . may actually produce physical torture or lingering death, [and] . . . [i]n less serious cases, . . . may result in pain and suffering no one suggests would serve any penological purpose." *Id.*

A claim alleging that prison officials have violated an inmate's Eighth Amendment rights by inflicting cruel and unusual punishment must satisfy both objective and subjective requirements. *Wright v. Goord*, 554 F.3d 255, 268 (2d Cir. 2009); *Price v. Reilly*, 697 F. Supp. 2d 344, 356 (E.D.N.Y. 2010). To satisfy the objective requirement, the Second Circuit has said that

[d]etermining whether a deprivation is an objectively serious deprivation entails two inquiries. The first inquiry is whether the prisoner was actually deprived of adequate medical care. As the Supreme Court has noted, the prison official's duty is only to provide reasonable medical care Second, the objective test asks whether the inadequacy in medical care is sufficiently serious. This inquiry requires the court to examine how the offending conduct is inadequate and what harm, if any, the inadequacy has caused or will likely cause the prisoner.

Salahuddin v. Goord, 467 F.3d 263, 279-80 (2d Cir. 2006) (citations omitted).

The second inquiry of the objective test requires a court to look at the seriousness of the inmate's medical condition if the plaintiff alleges a complete failure to provide treatment. *Smith v. Carpenter*, 316 F.3d 178,

185-86 (2d Cir. 2003). "Factors relevant to the seriousness of a medical condition include whether a reasonable doctor or patient would find it important and worthy of comment, whether the condition significantly affects an individual's daily activities, and whether it causes chronic and substantial pain." *Salahuddin*, 467 F.3d at 280 (quotation marks and alterations omitted).

If, on the other hand, a plaintiff's complaint alleges that treatment was provided but was inadequate, the second inquiry of the objective test is narrowly confined to that specific alleged inadequacy, rather than focusing upon the seriousness of the prisoner's medical condition.

Salahuddin, 467 F.3d at 280. "For example, if the prisoner is receiving ongoing treatment and the offending conduct is an unreasonable delay or interruption in that treatment, [the focus of the] inquiry [is] on the challenged delay or interruption in treatment, rather than the prisoner's underlying medical condition alone." *Id.* (quoting *Smith*, 316 F.3d at 185) (quotations marks omitted).

To satisfy the subjective requirement, a plaintiff must demonstrate that the defendant had "the necessary level of culpability, shown by actions characterized by 'wantonness.'" *Blyden*, 186 F.3d at 262. "In medical-treatment cases . . ., the official's state of mind need not reach the

level of knowing and purposeful infliction of harm; it suffices if the plaintiff proves that the official acted with deliberate indifference to inmate health." *Salahuddin*, 467 F.3d at 280. "Deliberate indifference," in a constitutional sense, "requires that the charged official act or fail to act while actually aware of a substantial risk that serious inmate harm will result." *Id.* (citing *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 837); *see also Leach v. Dufrain*, 103 F. Supp. 2d 542, 546 (N.D.N.Y. 2000) (Kahn, J.); *Waldo v. Goord*, No. 97-CV-1385, 1998 WL 713809, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 1998) (Kahn, J., *adopting report and recommendation by* Homer, M.J.). "Deliberate indifference is a mental state equivalent to subjective recklessness, as the term is used in criminal law." *Salahuddin*, 467 F.3d at 280 (citing *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 839-40).

In this instance, following the incident on August 25, 2011, plaintiff was taken to the prison infirmary and given a thorough physical examination by defendant Clark. Dkt. No. 39-8 at 16-17; Dkt. No. 39-21 at 2; Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. In light of plaintiff's complaints of jaw pain, defendant Clark examined his range of motion and determined that it was within the normal limits and found no injury to his mouth or lips. Dkt. No. 39-8 at 17; Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. Plaintiff also complained that he could not walk straight, and he was "walking bending down." Dkt. No. 39-8 at 17. Plaintiff's medical records, however, indicate that plaintiff was able to

walk without injury, and that his range of motion for his ankles, hips, knees, shoulders, neck, and elbows were all within normal limits. Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. The only injury discerned by defendant Clark was possible swelling, approximately the size of a dime, over his right cheek bone area. *Id.* Plaintiff's medical records do not indicate that he requested pain medication. *Id.* Prior to entering the Coxsackie SHU later that same day, plaintiff was reevaluated by defendant Clark. Dkt. No. 39-21 at 3; Dkt. No. 39-23 at 20. At that time, he denied any new concerns. *Id.* Defendant Clark reevaluated his right cheek area and found no swelling. *Id.* Defendant Clark also examined plaintiff's left testicle, which he claimed had been injured, but found no discoloration or swelling. *Id.* Plaintiff was instructed to apply a cold compress and to follow-up with a sick call as needed. Id. Again, nothing in plaintiff's medical records indicate that he requested pain medication, and he did not seek further medical treatment for the injuries he allegedly suffered on August 25, 2011. Dkt. No. 39-23 at 18-20; Dkt. No. 39-21 at 3.

Based upon the foregoing record evidence, which is largely undisputed, I find that no reasonable factfinder could conclude that defendant Clark's medical treatment of plaintiff was objectively inadequate. Neither of her two examinations of plaintiff on August 25, 2011, revealed

serious injuries. In fact, the only injury noted by defendant Clark was a dime-sized area of swelling on plaintiff's cheek. She advised plaintiff to use a cold compress and seek follow-up medical attention if needed. In consideration of the record as a whole, I find that there is nothing to suggest that defendant Clark provided plaintiff with inadequate medical care that was sufficiently serious under the Eighth Amendment.

Moreover, although plaintiff alleges in his complaint that defendant Clark "deliberately tr[ied] to cover up the injuries" allegedly resulting from the use of force by defendants Gundrum, Catlin, Pluckrose, and Morris, Dkt. No. 1 at 8, there is no record evidence to support this allegation. When asked at his deposition to describe the reasons for alleging that defendant Clark concealed plaintiff's injuries for the benefit of the defendants, he said, "Because she's a nurse and I asked for medication because I'm feeling pain and she refused to give it to me. She was trying to help the officers. She wasn't trying to help me." Dkt. No. 39-8 at 23. Even if plaintiff's testimony is credited, however, no reasonable factfinder could conclude that defendant Clark "act[ed] or fail[ed] to act while actually aware of a substantial risk that serious . . . harm [would] result" to the plaintiff. Salahuddin, 467 F.3d at 280. Accordingly, I recommend that plaintiff's deliberate medical indifference claim against defendant Clark be

dismissed.

F. False Misbehavior Report Claim

As a final matter, defendants seek dismissal of plaintiff's claim against defendant Gundrum arising from his issuance of an allegedly false misbehavior report to plaintiff. Dkt. No. 39-1 at 24-26. Defendants contend that plaintiff has no constitutional right to be free from the issuance of such a misbehavior report, and further that a claim is barred by the rule in *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), and *Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641 (1997), in light of the adverse disciplinary determination. *Id*.

It is true, as defendants assert, that the mere allegation that a false misbehavior report has been filed against an inmate, standing alone, does not implicate constitutional conduct. *Boddie v. Schnieder*, 105 F.3d 857, 862 (2d Cir. 1997). An additional allegation, however, that a defendant allegadly files a false misbehavior report prompted by retaliatory animus and results from the plaintiff exercising his constitutional rights can suffice to state a claim for retaliation. *Franco v. Kelly*, 854 F.2d 584, 589 (2d Cir. 1988). In this instance, plaintiff alleges that the August 25, 2011 misbehavior report, issued by defendant Gundrum, was part of a series of events orchestrated as retribution for him having filed a grievance against

defendant Rogers concerning the earlier, alleged assault by him on August 3, 2011. Liberally construed, those allegations state a claim of retaliation.

A cognizable section 1983 retaliation claim lies when prison officials take adverse action against an inmate that is motivated by the inmate's exercise of a constitutional right, including the free speech provisions of the First Amendment. See Friedl v. City of New York, 210 F.3d 79, 85 (2d Cir. 2000) ("In general, a section 1983 claim will lie where the government takes negative action against an individual because of his exercise of rights guaranteed by the Constitution or federal laws."). To state a prima facie claim under section 1983 for retaliatory conduct, a plaintiff must advance non-conclusory allegations establishing that (1) the conduct at issue was protected, (2) the defendants took adverse action against the plaintiff, and (3) there was a causal connection between the protected activity and the adverse action – in other words, that the protected conduct was a "substantial or motivating factor" in the prison officials' decision to take action against the plaintiff. Mount Healthy City Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle, 429 U.S. 274, 287 (1977); Dillon v. Morano, 497 F.3d 247, 251 (2d Cir. 2007); Garrett v. Reynolds, No. 99-CV-2065, 2003 WL 22299359, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 3, 2003) (Sharpe, M.J.). "[P]rison officials' conduct

constitutes an 'adverse action' when it 'would deter a similarly situated individual of ordinary firmness from exercising his or her constitutional rights." *Alicea v. Howell*, 387 F. Supp. 2d 227, 237 (W.D.N.Y. 2005) (quoting *Dawes v. Walker*, 239 F.3d 489, 492 (2d Cir. 2001)).

In this case, plaintiff's allegation that defendant Gundrum issued the misbehavior report against plaintiff on August 25, 2011, as a result of the earlier grievance plaintiff filed against defendant Rogers is sufficient to satisfy the first and second elements of the retaliation analysis. It is wellsettled that the filing of a grievance is constitutionally protected conduct. Johnson v. Eggersdorf, 8 F. App'x 140, 144 (2d Cir. 2001); Graham v. R.J. Henderson, 89 F.3d 75, 80 (2d Cir. 1996). It is equally well-established that a corrections officer's issuance of a misbehavior report against an inmate may constitute adverse action. See Gill v. Pidlypchak, 389 F.3d 379, 384 (2d Cir. 2004) ("[The plaintiff] sufficiently alleged . . . adverse action on the part of the defendants – the filing of false misbehavior reports against [him] and his sentence . . . – that would deter a prisoner of ordinary firmness from vindicating his . . . constitutional rights through the grievance process[.]"). As for the last requirement of a retaliation claim, causation, I find that there is sufficient record evidence to give rise to a genuine dispute of fact regarding whether defendant Gundrum issued the

misbehavior report to plaintiff as a result of the grievance plaintiff filed against defendant Rogers. Although there is no record evidence suggesting that defendant Gundrum knew about the specific grievance plaintiff filed against defendant Rogers resulting from the incident on August 3, 2011, plaintiff testified that, immediately before defendant Gundrum allegedly assaulted him on August 25, 2011 (the incident that ultimately gave rise to the misbehavior report), defendant Gundrum "asked [plaintiff] if [he] like[d] filing grievances on officers and he [was] going to give [plaintiff] something to file a grievance about." Dkt. No. 39-8 at 1. In light of this allegation, as well as the temporal proximity between plaintiff's grievance against defendant Rogers and the alleged false misbehavior report from defendant Gundrum, I find that a reasonable factfinder could conclude that defendant Gundrum's conduct was motivated by retaliatory animus. See Colon v. Coughlin, 58 F. 3d 865, 872 (2d Cir. 1995) ("[W]e have held that [close] temporal proximity between an inmate's lawsuit and disciplinary action may serve as circumstantial evidence of retaliation."); accord, Webster v. Fischer, 694 F.Supp. 2d 163, 183 (N.D.N.Y. 2010) (Kahn, J., adopting report and recommendation by Peebles, J.)).

Defendants maintain that the finding of guilt on the charges set forth in the misbehavior report negates plaintiff's allegation that it was issued

out of retaliatory motive. Dkt. No. 39-1 at 26. Although it is true that the hearing officer's finding of guilt seemingly belies any claim that the misbehavior report was false, it does not necessarily follow that defendant Gundrum's motivation for issuing it was without retaliatory animus. Under the circumstances of this case, it is appropriate for the factfinder to evaluate the plausibility of plaintiff's allegations regarding the conduct of defendant Gundrum, and specifically whether he prefaced the alleged assault on plaintiff by threatening him about filing grievances against corrections officers. See Graham v. Henderson, 89 F.3d 75, 81 (2d Cir. 1996) ("[B]ased on the current record, [the plaintiff]'s punishment was either wholly retaliatory or it was not retaliatory at all This question runs to matters of credibility and weight of the evidence, which are matters for the jury and should not be decided on summary judgment."). I therefore recommend that the portion of defendants' motion seeking dismissal of plaintiff's retaliation claim, based upon the issuance of the August 25, 2011 misbehavior report, be denied due to the existence of genuine, triable issues of material fact.

IV. <u>SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION</u>

Plaintiff's complaint in this action asserts claims of excessive force, retaliation, and deliberate medical indifference. While plaintiff commenced

this action without first filing and pursuing to completion a grievance concerning events occurring on and following August 25, 2011, I am unable to conclude at this procedural juncture that defendants should not be estopped from asserting failure-to-exhaust as a defense to those claims, and instead recommend that the court conduct an evidentiary hearing to probe this issue. The portion of defendants' motion seeking dismissal on the procedural ground of failure to exhaust should therefore be denied, without prejudice.

Turning to the merits of plaintiff's claims, I note that while there exist genuine, triable issues of fact precluding the entry of summary judgment with regard to plaintiff's excessive force and retaliation claims, no reasonable factfinder could conclude, based upon the record now before the court, that plaintiff's constitutional rights were violated by defendant Clark through deliberate indifference to plaintiff's serious medical needs. Accordingly, it is hereby respectfully

RECOMMENDED that defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 39) be GRANTED, in part, and that all claims against defendant Nina Clark be DISMISSED, but that defendants' motion otherwise be DENIED.

NOTICE: Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties may lodge

written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections must be filed with the clerk of the court within FOURTEEN days of service of this report. FAILURE TO SO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), 6(d), 72; *Roldan v. Racette*, 984 F.2d 85 (2d Cir. 1993).

It is also hereby

ORDERED that the clerk of the court serve a copy of this report and recommendation upon the parties in accordance with this court's local rules; and it is further hereby

ORDERED that the clerk adjust the court's records regarding this matter to reflect the correct names of the defendants as Scott Rogers,

Matthew Gundrum, Shawn Pluckrose, Jerrad Catlin, Paul Morris, and Nina Clark.

Dated: January 21, 2014

Syracuse, New York

David E. Peebles

U.S. Magistrate Judge



C Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, E.D. New York. Wayne HARGROVE, Plaintiff,

Sheriff Edward RILEY; Nassau County Correctional Facility, et al; Nassau County University Medical Staff and Nassau County Correctional Facility, Defendants.

Civil Action No. CV-04-4587 (DGT).

Jan. 31, 2007.

Wayne Hargrove, Ossining, NY, pro se.

Alexander V. Sansone, Troy & Troy, Lake Ronkonkoma, NY, Joseph Carney, Mineola, NY, for Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

TRAGER, J.

*1 Inmate Wayne Hargrove ("Hargrove" or "plaintiff") brings this *pro se* action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Nassau County Sheriff, Nassau County Correctional Facility ("NCCF") and NCCF's medical staff, (collectively, "defendants"), seeking damages for injuries allegedly caused by defendants while he was incarcerated at NCCF. Defendants now move for summary judgment pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 56 arguing, *inter alia*, that Hargrove's claims should be dismissed because he failed to exhaust administrative remedies, as required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA"), 42 U.S.C. § 1997e. For the following reasons, defendants' motions for summary judgment are granted.

Background

On August 27, 2004, FNI Hargrove filed a complaint, alleging that defendants violated his civil rights when they forcibly administered purified protein derivative skin tests ("PPD test") to test for latent tuberculosis ("TB") in April 2002, 2003 and 2004 while he was incarcerated at NCCF. Complaint, Ex. C; Aff. in Opp. at 1-4, Ex. A. Hargrove named Nassau County Sheriff Edward Reilly ("Reilly"), NCCF and Nassau County University Medical Staff FN2 as defendants. FN3 On November 22, 2004, after discovery, County Defendants and NHCC Defendants filed separate motions for summary judgment pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 56. Both defendants properly filed a Local Rule 56.1 Statement and served Hargrove a Notice to *Pro Se* Litigant Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 56.2.

FN1. Hargrove signed the complaint August 27, 2004. The pro se clerk's office received and filed the complaint on September 20, 2004. Under the prison mail-box rule, a pro se prisoner's complaint is deemed filed when it is delivered to prison authorities. See, e.g., Walker v. Jastremski, 430 F.3d 560, Cir.2005)(deeming pro se prisoner's § 1983 action filed on date complaint was handed to prison officials). There is no evidence in the record as to when Hargrove handed the complaint to prison officials. However, it is clear the operative date is between August 27, 2004 and September 20, 2004. As discussed, infra, both of these dates occur before Hargrove properly exhausted the administrative remedies available to him at NCCF.

FN2. The Nassau County University Medical Staff are employed by the Nassau Health Care Corporation ("NHCC"). Pursuant to the Correctional Center Health Services Agreement between the County of Nassau and NHCC, dated September 24, 1999, NHCC provides medical services for inmates at NCCF. County Defs.'s

Not. of Motion, Decl., at 1.

FN3. Reilly and NCCF are represented separately from NHCC. Accordingly, when a distinction is necessary, Reilly and NCCF will be referred to as "County Defendants" and Nassau County University Medical Staff and NHCC will be referred to as "NHCC Defendants."

(1)

Tuberculosis Testing at NCCF

Upon entering NCCF, new prisoners must first go through medical intake. Aff. of Kim Edwards, ("Edwards Aff.") ¶ 3. This standard process usually takes seventy-two hours. Edwards Aff. ¶ 4. During medical intake, NCCF tests inmates for TB. Aff. of Getachew Feleke ("Feleke Aff.") ¶ 3. NCCF generally uses a PPD test to detect latent TB. Feleke Aff. ¶ 3. However, if an inmate has previously tested positive for TB, it is NCCF's policy to test for TB using an x-ray instead. FN4 Feleke Aff. ¶ 3. As part of its Infectious Disease Program, NCCF re-tests inmates for TB each year, beginning after they have been housed in that facility for one year. Edwards Aff. ¶ 5.

FN4. According to WebMD, "[a] tuberculin skin test should not be done for people who have a(1) Known TB infection [or a] (2) Positive tuberculin skin test in the past. A second test may cause a more severe reaction to the TB antigens." Jan Nissl, RN, BS, *Tuberculin Skin Tests*, W E B M D , h t t p : //www.webmd.com/hw/lab_tests/hw203560.asp (last visited Jan. 31, 2007).

(2)

Hargrove's Tuberculosis Testing at NCCF

On March 15, 2002, Hargrove was incarcerated at NCCF.

© 2010 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 1. Before entering the general population, Hargrove was processed through medical intake. NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 2. The NCCF Medical Intake Chart for Hargrove, dated March 15,2002 ("3/15/02 Chart"), shows that Hargrove informed medical staff that he had previously been exposed to tuberculosis. NHCC Defs.' Notice of Mot., Ex. C, at 1; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 2. The 3/15/02 Chart also shows that Hargrove reported testing positive to a prior PPD test and that he had been treated for TB in 2000. NHCC Defs.' Notice of Mot., Ex. C, at 1. Hargrove alleges that he was exposed to and treated for TB in 1997. Hargrove's Aff. in Opp. to Mot. for Summary Judgment, ("Aff. in Opp."), Ex. A at 1-2. Defendants contend that Hargrove was given an x-ray during the medical intake process because of his reported positive PPD test, and that the x-ray was negative, showing no active TB infection. NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 2; Edwards Aff. ¶ 3. Without specifying a date, Hargrove generally states that his "request to be x-rayed was denied." Aff. in Opp. at 3.

*2 Pursuant to NCCF's Infectious Disease Program, after being incarcerated in NCCF for a year, Hargrove was scheduled to be re-tested for TB. Edwards Aff. ¶ 5; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 4. On May 24, 2003, Hargrove was given a PPD skin test. Edwards Aff. ¶ 5; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 4. This test was negative. Edwards Aff. ¶ 5; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 4. According to Hargrove, he requested an x-ray instead of a PPD test because of his previous exposure to TB, but was forced to submit to the PPD test. He also alleges that defendants threatened to put him in "keep lock" or "lock up" unless he submitted to the PPD test. FNS Complaint, Ex. C; Aff. in Opp. at 1-4, Ex. A.

FN5. Hargrove has made contradictory statements about being placed in "keep lock" or "lock up". It is unclear whether he is alleging that defendants threatened to place him in "lock up" unless he submitted to the PPD test or whether he was actually placed in "lock up" until such time that he agreed to submit to the PPD tests. For example, in his complaint, Hargrove states that when he "refused to submit to another [PPD] test, the Correctional Authorities were brought in and placed [him] in lock up." Complaint ¶ 4. In a hearing before Magistrate Judge Bloom on

January 31, 2005, Hargrove stated that he took the PPD tests because he was told that he would be placed in "lock up" until he submitted to the test. Hr'g Tr. 6:1-18; 9:5-10:10. In Exhibit B to his complaint, Hargrove alleges both that he was given an unwarranted TB shot and that when he refused the same shot he was placed in "keep lock." Complaint, Ex. B. There is no evidence in the record that Hargrove was ever segregated from the general population while housed at NCCF, outside of the seventy-two hour initial medical intake period. Aff. of Sgt. Neumann ("Neumann Aff.") at 1-2 (referring to prison records showing Hargrove's holding locations which demonstrate that he was never placed in "lock up"); NCCF 56.1 Statement ¶ E. Whether or not Hargrove was actually placed in "lock up" is not a material fact for purposes of this motion; as explained in detail, infra, Hargrove's failure to exhaust administrative remedies under the PLRA precludes a consideration of the merits of his Section 1983 claim.

The following year, in June of 2004, Hargrove was scheduled to be retested. Edwards Aff. ¶ 6; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 5. Because of the contradiction between the negative May 2003 PPD test and his reported positive history, NCCF contacted the Infectious Disease Department of the Nassau County Medical Center. Edwards Aff. ¶ 6. It was suggested that Hargrove be given a two-step PPD test, administered fifteen days apart. Feleke Aff. ¶ 4; Edwards Aff. ¶ 6. Hargrove was given these two PPD skin tests in June 2004. Edwards Aff. ¶ 6; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 5. Again, Hargrove alleges that these tests were administered against his will and under threat of being placed in quarantine. Complaint, Exs. A, B; Aff. in Opp., Ex. A.

On December 3, 2004, Hargrove was seen by a physician's assistant. NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 6. During this meeting, Hargrove complained of a dry cough and that the site on his forearm where the June 2004 PPD tests had been administered was red and swollen. NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 6; 11/28/04 Sick Call Request.

Hargrove's December 18, 2004 chart notes a positive PPD

test and an order was placed in the chart that Hargrove not be submitted for future PPD tests. Edwards Aff. ¶ 7; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 8. See also 11/19/2004 Grievance.

Hargrove alleges that the following physical ailments were caused by the PPD tests: chronic coughing, <u>high blood pressure</u>, chronic back pain, <u>lung infection</u>, dizzy spells, blurred vision and a permanent scar on both his forearms. Complaint, Ex. C; Aff. in Opp. at 3-4.

(3)

NCCF's Inmate Grievance Procedure

NCCF has had an inmate grievance program ("IGP") in place since 2001. Aff. of Kenneth Williams, ("Williams Aff."), at 2. NCCF's IGP is carried out in conformance with the New York State Commission of Corrections Minimum Standards and Regulations for Management of County Jails and Penitentiaries ("Minimum Standards"). *Id.*

The IGP is designed to resolve complaints and grievances that an inmate may have regarding the inmate's care and treatment while incarcerated at NCCF. Williams Aff. at 2. Upon entering NCCF, all inmates receive a copy of the NCCF inmate handbook, which outlines the IGP. *Id*.

*3 The record does not include an actual copy of NCCF's IGP, but the NCCF's IGP is detailed in the affidavit of NCCF Investigator Kenneth Williams. FN6 The IGP encourages inmates to resolve their grievances informally with the staff member assigned to the inmate housing unit first. *Id.* If an acceptable resolution cannot be reached, inmates must then proceed through the formal three-step process set out in the IGP. *Id.* at 3.

FN6. Hargrove does dispute any statements made by Investigator Williams regarding the inmate grievance procedure, time limits or its availability to him. Furthermore, Hargrove does

not dispute that he received a handbook outlining the IGP.

The first step requires an inmate to submit his grievance form FN7 to the Inmate Grievance Unit by placing it in a locked box located in each housing area, "within five days of the date of the act or occurrence giving rise to the grievance." FN8 Id. at 2-3. NCCF indexes all grievance forms filed by inmates in a log book and in a computer system. Id. at 1, 3. Once a grievance form is received by the Inmate Grievance Unit, the grievance is investigated and the inmate will receive a written determination of the outcome from the Inmate Grievance Coordinator in Section II of the grievance form. $\frac{\text{FN9}}{\text{Id}}$. at 3. The inmate is then given a choice to accept or appeal the decision by checking the desired selection and signing his name in Section III of the grievance form. See, e.g., 11/19/2004 Grievance form. If the inmate is not satisfied with the decision of the Inmate Grievance Coordinator, the inmate may appeal the determination to the Chief Administrative Officer. Williams Aff. at 3. Finally, if the inmate is not satisfied with the Chief Administrative Officer's determination, the inmate may appeal to the New York State Commission of Correction Citizen's Policy and Complaint Review Council ("Council"). Id. at 3. The Council will then render a final determination. Id. at 3.

FN7. The grievance forms contain four sections to be utilized throughout all three steps of the IGP. Section I provides space for the inmate to explain his complaint and the actions he requests as relief. Section II is for the decision of the Inmate Grievance Coordinator. Section III is titled "Acceptance/Appeal of Grievance Coordinator's decision" and contains two mutually exclusive options in which the inmate must choose one or the other: "I have read and accept the Grievance Coordinator's decision," or "I have read and appeal the Grievance Coordinator's decision." Section IV provides space for the decision of the Chief Administrative Officer.

<u>FN8.</u> Hargrove has not argued that he was unaware of this five-day deadline.

<u>FN9.</u> There is no evidence in the record specifying the how long an inmate has to appeal inaction by the Inmate Grievance Unit.

(4)

Authenticity of the Grievance Forms and Other Documents Submitted by Hargrove

In support of his allegations that he continuously informed defendants that he had been exposed to TB and, therefore, should not have been given PPD tests, Hargrove submitted three letters with his complaint, two of which were addressed to the Inmate Grievance Committee and one of which was addressed to "To whom this may concern." Complaint, Exs. A-C. He also submitted five complaint letters written to Sheriff Reilly, seventeen sick call requests and nine grievance forms during discovery and with his Affidavit in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, explaining that some of the medical records and notarized letters were "missing." Aff. in Opp. Ex. A at 2. Defendants call the authenticity of most of these documents into question, contending that Hargrove never submitted any grievance form or complaint letter before he filed his complaint. County Defs.' Mem. of Law at 16-21; County Defs.' 56.1 Statement at ¶ ¶ B2, C3, D3.

Kenneth Williams, an investigator at NCCF in the Inmate Grievance Unit, testified that he reviewed all of the grievance forms, complaint letters and sick call requests annexed to Hargrove's Complaint and to Hargrove's Affidavit in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Williams Aff. at 2. Williams testified that he examined the grievance records at NCCF and searched "for any grievances by plaintiff/inmate Hargrove" and found "only two." FN10 Williams Aff. at 1. The first grievance, dated November 19, 2004, complained that the medical staff continued "forcing [Hargrove] to take a T.B. shot while [he] keep[s] telling them that [he] has been exposed to T.B." 11/19/2004 Grievance; Williams Aff. at 1. In response to this grievance, Hargrove's "positive" TB status was noted in his medical records and an order was placed in Hargrove's medical chart, stating that Hargrove not be subjected to future PPD tests. 11/19/2004 Grievance, Section II;

Williams Aff. at 1; NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶ 8; Edwards Aff. ¶ 7. In Section III of the 11/19/2004 Grievance, Hargrove acknowledged that he had read the Grievance Coordinator's decision, and that he chose to accept the decision instead of appealing it. 11/19/2004 Grievance. The other grievance received by the Grievance Unit, dated May 11, 2005, complained of an unrelated matter. 5/11/2005 Grievance (complaining of back problems and requesting the return of his medical shoes); Williams Aff. at 1. Thus, Williams concluded that, beside the 11/19/2004 and 5/11/2005 Grievance Forms, none of the other documents were "received by the grievance unit, and, given the locked box system, the grievance-forms were never submitted by plaintiff/inmate." Williams Aff. at 2.

<u>FN10.</u> It is NCCF's procedure to forward to the attention of the Grievance Unit all official grievance forms and complaint letters-even ones not specifically addressed to the Grievance Unit. Williams Aff. at 3.

*4 A visual examination of the grievance forms Hargrove submitted in support of his claims suggests forgery. Five of the nine grievance forms were requests to stop PPD testing. See April 19, 2002 grievance; April 28, 2002 grievance; April 20, 2003 grievance; April 28, 2003 grievance; November 19, 2004 grievance. The remaining grievance forms concerned Hargrove's requests for medical shoes. See March 18, 2002 grievance; July 6, 2002 grievance; February 20, 2003 grievance; May 11, 2005 grievance. Of the grievance forms complaining of unwanted PPD tests, the April 28, 2002 grievance form is a patent photocopy of the April 19, 2002 grievance form, and the April 28, 2003 grievance form is a patent photocopy copy of the April 20, 2003 grievance form, with only the handwritten dates changed. The only potentially authentic grievance forms relating to Hargrove's complaint about the PPD testing are dated April 19, 2002, April 20, 2003, and November 19, 2004. Of these grievance forms, only the November 19, 2004 has been authenticated by NCCF personnel. See generally Williams Aff. at 1-4.

Turning to the complaint letters addressed to Reilly, many contain notary stamps cut from the bottom of unrelated

documents and photocopied onto the bottom of the complaint letters. See County Defs.' Mem. of Law at 18-21. C.O. Thomas McDevitt and C.O. Paul Klein, both of whom perform notary services for prisoners at NCCF, have submitted sworn affidavits, stating that they kept individual Notary Log Books covering all dates relevant to this litigation. Aff. of C.O. Klein, ("Klein Aff."), at 1; Aff. of C.O. McDevitt, ("McDevitt Aff."), at 1. McDevitt's Notary Log Book shows that he notarized only one document for Hargrove. This document, dated May 13, 2002, was a motion related to Hargrove's criminal trial. McDevitt Aff. at 1-2. Hargrove signed the Notary Log Book acknowledging receipt of that notarized motion. McDevitt Aff. at 2. McDevitt states that he never notarized any other documents for Hargrove. McDevitt Aff. at 2. However, McDevitt's stamp and signature dated May 13, 2002 (the date of the legitimate notarization) appear on Hargrove's letter to Sheriff Reilly dated May 10, 2002. County Defs.' Not. of Motion, Ex. A.

These facts repeat themselves in regard to the documents bearing the notary stamp and signature of Klein. Klein had performed several legitimate notarizations for Hargrove in connection to Hargrove's criminal trial. Klein Aff. at 1-2. Hargrove signed Klein's Notary Log Book acknowledging receipt of those notarized documents. Klein Aff. at 2. However, Klein states that he never notarized any of Hargrove's letters addressed to Sheriff Reilly that bear Klein's stamp and signature. Klein Aff. at 2. On all of the documents that Hargrove submitted bearing Klein's stamp and signature, the dates and signatures of Klein match identically to the dates on which he had performed legitimate notarizations for Hargrove in connection with his criminal trial. Defendants argue it is clear that the documents bearing the stamps and signatures of McDevitt and Klein were not actually notarized by these notaries. County Defs.' Mem. of Law at 17-22.

*5 Hargrove does not deny these allegations. Instead, he resubmits the documents that McDevitt and Klein testify they did not notarize with his Affidavit in Opposition and insists that the documents "refute[] the assertions put forth by the defendants." Aff. in Opp. at 2.

Discussion

(1)

Summary Judgment Standard

A motion for summary judgment is granted when "there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and ... the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed.R.Civ.P.56(c). A court ruling on a summary judgment motion must construe the facts in the light most favorable to the non-moving party and draw all reasonable inferences in his favor. See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986); Williams v. Metropolitan Detention Center, 418 F.Supp.2d 96, 100 (E.D.N.Y.2005). Defendants, the moving party in this action, bear the burden of demonstrating the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. Baisch v. Gallina, 346 F.3d 366, 371 (2d Cir.2003).

As Hargrove is proceeding pro se, his complaint must be reviewed carefully and liberally, and be interpreted to "raise the strongest argument it suggests," Green v. United States, 260 F.3d 78, 83 (2d Cir.2001), particularly when civil rights violations are alleged, see, e.g., McEachin v. McGuinnis, 357 F.3d 197, 200 (2d Cir.2004). Plaintiff's complaint does not specify the legal theories upon which it relies, but, in construing his complaint to raise its strongest arguments, it will be interpreted to raise claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See, e.g., Dufort v. Burgos, No. 04-CV-4940, 2005 WL 2660384, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 18, 2005) (liberally construing plaintiff's complaint, which failed to specify the legal theory or theories upon which it rested, as, inter alia, a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); Williams, 418 F.Supp.2d at 100 (same).

(2)

Prison Litigation Reform Act

a. Purpose of the Prison Litigation Reform Act

The PLRA was intended to "reduce the quantity and improve the quality of prisoner suits." Woodford v. Ngo,

--- U.S. ----, 126 S.Ct. 2378, 2387 (2006) (quoting <u>Porter v. Nussle</u>, 534 U.S. 516, 524 (2002)). It seeks to eliminate unwarranted interference with the administration of prisons by federal courts, and thus "'affor[d] corrections officials time and opportunity to address complaints internally before allowing the initiation of a federal case.' "<u>Woodford</u>, 126 S.Ct. at 2387 (quoting <u>Porter</u>, 534 U.S. at 525). See also <u>Booth v. Churner</u>, 532 U.S. 731, 739 (2001). Formal grievance procedures allow prison officials to reconsider their policies, implement the necessary corrections and discipline prison officials who fail to follow existing policy. See <u>Ruggiero v. County of Orange</u>, 467 F.3d 170, 177-78 (2d Cir.2006).

b. The Exhaustion Requirement

The PLRA's "invigorated" exhaustion provision, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), provides the mechanism to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of prisoners' suits by requiring that prison officials have the opportunity to address prisoner complaints through internal processes before allowing a case to proceed in federal court. Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2382 (citing Porter, 534 U.S. at 524). Section 1997e(a) provides that:

*6 [n]o action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.

42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

The exhaustion requirement is a mandatory condition precedent to any suit challenging prison conditions, including suits brought under Section 1983. Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2383;Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 174;Williams, 418 F.Supp.2d at 100-01. The exhaustion provision is applicable to suits seeking relief, such as money damages, that may not be available in prison administrative proceedings, as long as other forms of relief are obtainable through administrative channels. Giano v. Goord, 380 F.3d 670, 675 (2d Cir.2004); see also Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2382-83 ("[A] prisoner must now exhaust

administrative remedies even where the relief sought-monetary damages-cannot be granted by the administrative process.") (citing <u>Booth</u>, 532 U.S. at 734).

In June 2006, the Supreme Court held that the PLRA requires "proper exhaustion" before a case may proceed in federal court. Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2387. "Proper exhaustion" requires a prisoner to use " 'all steps that the agency holds out, and doing so properly (so that the agency addresses the issues on the merits)." "Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 176 (citing Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2385 (emphasis in original)). Although the level of detail necessary to properly exhaust a prison's grievance process will vary from system to system, Jones v. Bock, 127 S.Ct. 910, 2007 WL 135890, at *12 (Jan. 22, 2007), "proper exhaustion" under the PLRA "'demands compliance with [that] agency's deadlines and other critical procedural rules." "Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 176 (quoting Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2386). Thus, the PLRA's exhaustion requirement is not satisfied by "untimely or otherwise procedurally defective attempts to secure administrative remedies." Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 176 (citing Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2382).

(3)

Exhaustion Analysis: Hargrove did not Exhaust the Administrative Remedies Made Available by NCCF prior to Bringing Suit

Section 1997e(a) of the PLRA applies to Hargrove's complaint; Hargrove was and continues to be confined in a correctional facility, see Berry v. Kerik, 366 F.3d 85, 87 (2d Cir.2004), and Hargrove's claim is about a "prison condition" within the meaning of the PLRA, see Williams, 418 F.Supp.2d at 101. See also Sloane v. W. Mazzuca, No. 04-CV-8266, 2006 WL 3096031, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 31, 2006) (recognizing PLRA's application to complaint alleging retaliation by prison officials for plaintiff's refusal to consent to a PPD test). Accordingly, the merits of Hargrove's Section 1983 claims can only be addressed if it is first determined that Hargrove properly exhausted each claim under Section 1997e(a) of the PLRA before filing his complaint in federal court.

*7 Hargrove has submitted both forged FN11 and authentic grievance forms in opposing defendants' motions for summary judgment. Excluding, for the moment, the forged documents, NCCF's records reflect that Hargrove did not submit his first grievance until after he filed the instant complaint. Williams Aff. at 1. Hargrove's first grievance complaining of unwanted PPD testing is dated November 19, 2004, Williams Aff. at 1, two to three months after Hargrove filed his complaint. Additionally, this first grievance, dated November 19, 2004, was submitted five months after the last PPD test was administered to him in June 2004. NHCC Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶¶ 5,6. This five-month period far exceeds the five-day window provided by NCCF's IGP. Since Hargrove failed to comply with the IGP's deadlines, he did not properly exhaust the available administrative remedies. Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 176 (" 'untimely or otherwise procedurally defective attempts to secure administrative remedies do not satisfy the PLRA's exhaustion requirement.' ") (quoting Woodford, 126 S.Ct. at 2382).

> FN11. Based on an examination of the documents themselves, as well as uncontradicted testimony of the notaries performing services for prisoners at NCCF, see generally Klein Aff.; McDevitt Aff., and of the investigator in the Inmate Grievance Unit, see generally Williams Aff., it appears that many of the documents submitted by Hargrove are forgeries. However, in order to view the facts in the light most favorable to Hargrove, and so as to avoid making findings of fact in a summary judgment motion, for the purposes of the exhaustion analysis, all of the documents will be considered to be authentic. However, for purposes of the sanctions analysis, the documents will be explored and the consequences of Hargrove's misrepresentations will be addressed.

Furthermore, even if the falsified grievance forms Hargrove submitted in support of his claim are considered authentic, they are still untimely. The diagnostic TB tests (whether x-ray or PPD tests) were given to Hargrove on March 15, 2002, May 24, 2003 and in June of 2004, but the grievance forms Hargrove submitted complaining of unwanted PPD tests are dated April 19, 2002, April 28, 2002, April 20, 2003, April 28, 2003 and November 19,

2004. None of these grievances were filed "within five days of the of the date of the act or occurrence giving rise to the grievance." Williams Aff. at 3. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that NCCF's IGP allows for a tolling of the five-day time limit in which to file a grievance. FN12

FN12. Even if the submitted grievances had been filed within the proscribed time period, they only show that Hargrove's grievances reached an Inmate Grievance Coordinator, the first formal step of NCCF's three-step administrative grievance process; Hargrove never appealed to the Chief Administrative Officer. By failing to take the next available step in NCCF's IGP, Hargrove failed to satisfy the mandatory exhaustion requirement. See, e.g., Williams, 418 F.Supp.2d at 101, 102 (dismissing pro se complaint where plaintiff could only show he exhausted two of the four-step process mandated by prison's administrative process).

While the letters to Reilly and sick call requests show that Hargrove attempted to bring his complaints about the PPD testing to the attention of the prison staff, see, e.g., Aff. in Opp., Exs. A-D, NCCF's IGP requires use of formal grievance forms. Thus, writing complaint letters and submitting sick call requests did not properly exhaust NCCF's available administrative remedies. See, e.g., Hernandez v. Coffey, No. 99-CV-11615, 2006 WL 2109465, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. July 26, 2006) (holding letters did not satisfy plaintiff's exhaustion obligation); Williams, 418 F.Supp.2d at 101 (holding that because plaintiff's efforts to convey his medical condition through letters and conversations with the warden and medical staff did "not include the required steps of the PLRA's administrative remedy process," plaintiff failed to exhaust); Mills v. Garvin, No. 99-CV-6032, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3333, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 2, 2001) ("letter writing is not the equivalent of an exhaustion of administrative remedies under the PLRA").

As Hargrove failed to properly exhaust his administrative remedies, this action is precluded by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a) unless Hargrove can establish excuse for his failure to exhaust.

(4)

No Grounds to Excuse Plaintiff's Failure to Exhaust

*8 Exhaustion is an affirmative defense that defendants have the duty to raise. Jones, 2007 WL 135890, at * 8-11; Sloane, 2006 WL 3096031, at *4; Williams, 418 F.Supp.2d at 101. Once argued by the defendants, a plaintiff has an opportunity to show why the exhaustion requirement should be excused or why his failure to exhaust is justified. See Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 175; Collins v. Goord, 438 F.Supp.2d 399, 411 (S.D.N.Y.2006) ("[T]he Second Circuit has cautioned that 'while the PLRA's exhaustion requirement is 'mandatory,' certain caveats apply."")(internal citations omitted). Thus, before concluding that a prisoner failed to exhaust available administrative remedies as required by Section 1997e(a) of the PLRA, the following three factors must be considered: (1) whether administrative remedies were actually available to the prisoner; (2) whether defendants have either waived the defense of failure to exhaust or acted in such a way as to estop them from raising the defense; and (3) whether special circumstances, such as a reasonable misunderstanding of the grievance procedures, exist justifying the prisoner's failure to comply with the exhaustion requirement. Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 175 (citing Hemphill v. New York, 380 F.3d 680, 686 (2d Cir.2004)).

FN13. Courts in the Second Circuit have questioned what effect, if any, the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Woodford* requiring "proper exhaustion" may have on the three-step *Hemphill* inquiry. The Second Circuit has yet to address this issue. See Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 175-76 (declining to "determine what effect Woodford has on our case law in this area ... because [plaintiff] could not have prevailed even under our pre-Woodford case law). To date, district courts have acknowledged the tension, but resolved to apply *Hemphill* to exhaustion claims until instructed otherwise by the Second Circuit. See, e.g., Larkins v. Selsky, 04-CV-5900, 2006 WL 3548959, at *9, n. 4 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 6,

2006) (applying the current law of the Second Circuit to exhaustion claims); Sloane, 2006 WL 3096031, at *5 ("Until such time as the Court of Appeals considers the impact of Woodford, if any, on its prior rulings, this Court must follow the law of the Second Circuit. The Court will therefore apply the current law of this circuit to the exhaustion claims."); Collins v. Goord, 438 F.Supp.2d at 411 n. 13 (acknowledging that Woodford and Hemphill may be in tension, but deciding exhaustion claims under Hemphill inquiry); Hernandez v. Coffey, No. 99-CV11615, 2006 WL 2109465, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. July 26, 2006) (same). Here, Hargrove does not prevail under Hemphill; therefore, there is no occasion to address the potential effect Woodford may have had in his case.

a. Whether administrative remedies were "available" to Hargrove

The first step in the *Hemphill* inquiry requires a court to determine whether administrative remedies were available to the prisoner. *Hemphill*, 380 F.3d at 686. The test for assessing availability is an "objective one: that is, would a similarly situated individual of ordinary firmness have deemed them available." *Id.* at 688 (internal quotation marks omitted). In making this determination, "courts should be careful to look at the applicable set of grievance procedures." *Abney v. McGinnis*, 380 F.3d 663, 668 (2d Cir.2004). Exhaustion may be considered unavailable in situations where plaintiff is unaware of the grievance procedures or did not understand it, *Ruggiero*, 467 F.3d at 179, or where defendants' behavior prevents plaintiff from seeking administrative remedies, FN14 Hemphill v. State of New York, 380 F.3d 680, 686 (2d Cir.2004).

FN14. Case law does not clearly distinguish between situations in which defendants' behavior renders administrative remedies "unavailable" to the plaintiff and cases in which defendants are estopped from asserting non-exhaustion as an affirmative defense because of their behavior. As such, there will be some overlap in the analyses.

Here, Hargrove has not claimed that NCCF's administrative grievance procedure was unavailable to him. In fact, Hargrove demonstrated his access to and knowledge of NCCF's IGP by filing proper grievances on November 19, 2004 and on May 10, 2005. Hargrove did not dispute any part of Investigator Williams's affidavit detailing the IGP and its availability to inmates since 2001. Specifically, Hargrove did not dispute, upon entering the facility, that he received a copy of the inmate handbook outlining the IGP. He has not claimed that he is unfamiliar with or unaware of NCCF's IGP. Hargrove has not alleged that prison officials failed to advance his grievances FNI5 or that they threatened him or took any other action which effectively rendered the administrative process unavailable.

FN15. Although not specifically alleged, interpreting the evidence to "raise the strongest argument," Hargrove may be arguing that NCCF's IGP was not available to him because the Grievance Coordinator failed to respond to his grievances. In the single grievance regarding PPD tests that defendants concede is authentic, Hargrove writes, "[n]ow for the third time your office refused to answer my grievances so please look into this matter because the T.B. shot is [sic] effecting my health." 11/19/04 Grievance. This language implies that Hargrove filed grievances in the past and received no response from the Inmate Grievance Coordinator. Furthermore, Hargrove wrote on one of the submitted copies of the November 19, 2004 grievance that "[t]his is the only accepte[sic] that Plaintiff got back from all grievances and letters that the Plaintiff sent to Sheriff Riley and his medical staffs about his staff making [sic] take T.B. test for 3 year[s]." County Defs.' Not. of Motion, Ex. A, 11/19/2004 grievance.

First, it must be reiterated that filing of the initial grievances was untimely. However, even assuming arguendo that the original grievances had been timely filed, district courts in the Second Circuit have held that the "lack of a response from the [Inmate Grievance Review Committee] does not excuse an inmate's obligation to exhaust his

remedies through available appeals." Hernandez v. Coffey, 2006 WL 2109465, at *3-5. See also <u>Hemphill</u>, 380 F.3d. at 686 ("Threats or other intimidation by prison officials may well deter a prisoner of 'ordinary firmness' from filing an internal grievance, but not from appealing directly to individuals in positions of greater authority within the prison system"); Acosta v. Corr. Officer Dawkins, No. 04-CV-6678, 2005 WL 1668627, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2005) (inmate required to appeal lack of response to exhaust administrative remedies); Mendoza v. Goord, No. 00-CV-0146, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22573, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 21, 2002) ("If, as a result of a negligent error by prison officials-or even their deliberate attempt to sabotage a prisoner's grievance-the prisoner [does not receive a response] on his complaint, he is not thereby forestalled from appealing"). Hargrove did not assert or offer evidence suggesting that he appealed the unresponsiveness or that those appeals were not advanced.

*9 Additionally, Hargrove's transfer from NCCF to Sing Sing Correctional Facility ("Sing Sing") in July 2005 did not excuse his previous failure to properly exhaust. See, e.g., Sims v. Blot, No. 00-CV-2524, 2003 WL 21738766, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. July 25, 2003) (determining that failure to exhaust administrative remedies is not excused by transfer to another facility); Santiago v. Meinsen, 89 F.Supp.2d 435, 440-41 (S.D.N.Y.2000) (determining that plaintiff should not be "rewarded" for failing to participate in grievance procedure before being transferred). Hargrove had ample opportunity to properly file his grievances and to appeal their results as required by NCCF's procedures while he was imprisoned at NCCF. The last PPD test Hargrove complains of was given in 2004; therefore, Hargrove had until June or July of 2004 to timely file his grievance in accordance with NCCF's IGP. Hargrove was not transferred to Sing Sing until July 2005. County Defs.' Mem. of Law at 2. Thus, Hargrove's transfer cannot excuse his previous failure to properly exhaust.

b. Estoppel

The second step of the inquiry asks whether defendants are estopped from raising exhaustion as a defense. Specifically, "whether the defendants may have forfeited the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it, or whether the defendants' own actions inhibiting the inmate's exhaustion of remedies may estop one or more of the defendants from raising the plaintiff's failure to exhaust as a defense." <u>Hemphill</u>, 380 F.3d at 686 (internal citations omitted).

Here, Hargrove has not made any statements that would permit a finding that defendants should be estopped from raising the affirmative defense of exhaustion or that defendants waived the right to raise the defense. Defendants first raised the PLRA's exhaustion requirement as an affirmative defense in their respective answers. See County Defs.' Am. Answer at 3; NHCC Defs.' Answer at 1. County Defendants raised it again in their motion for summary judgment. See County Defs.' Mem of Law at 15-23. Thus, defendants are not estopped from raising the affirmative defense now. See, e.g., Sloane, 2006 WL 3096031, at *8 (exhaustion defense not waived where defendants first raised it in their motion to dismiss).

Additionally, defendants have not threatened Hargrove or engaged in other conduct preventing him from exhausting the available administrative remedies. Cf. Ziemba v. Wezner, 366 F.3d 161, 162 (2d Cir.2004) (holding defendants were estopped from asserting non-exhaustion because of prison officials' beatings, threats and other conduct inhibiting the inmate from filing proper grievances); Feliciano v. Goord, No. 97-CV-263, 1998 WL 436358, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 1998) (holding defendants were estopped from asserting non-exhaustion where prison officials refused to provide inmate with grievance forms, assured him that the incidents would be investigated by staff as a prerequisite to filing a grievance, and provided prisoner with no information about results of investigation). Hargrove has not argued otherwise. See Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 178 (holding defendants were not estopped from asserting a failure to exhaust defense where plaintiff pointed to no affirmative act by prison officials that would have prevented him from pursing administrative remedies); Sloane, 2006 WL 3096031, at *8 (finding no estoppel where plaintiff did not argue that defendants prevented him from pursuing the available administrative remedies); Hernandez, 2006 WL 2109465,

at *4 (finding no estoppel where plaintiff did not argue that any threats or intimidation prevented him from pursuing his appeals). Thus, for the same reasons that administrative remedies were not deemed unavailable to Hargrove, defendants are not estopped from raising a failure to exhaust defense.

c. Special circumstances

*10 Even where administrative remedies are available and the defendants are not estopped from arguing exhaustion, the court must "consider whether 'special circumstances' have been plausibly alleged that justify 'the prisoner's failure to comply with administrative procedural requirements.' " Hemphill, 380 F.3d at 688 (quoting Giano, 380 F.3d at 676). For example, plaintiff's reasonable interpretation of regulations differing from prison official's interpretation has been held to constitute a "special circumstance." Giano, 380 F.3d at 676-77. No special circumstances have been alleged that would excuse Hargrove from availing himself of administrative remedies. See Sloane, 2006 WL 3096031, at *8; Freeman v. Goord, No. 02-CV-9033, 2004 U .S. Dist. LEXIS 23873, at * 9-10 (S.D.N.Y.2004) (granting motion to dismiss where "there is no evidence in the record ... of any 'special circumstances' in this action.")

(5)

Hargrove's Failure to Exhaust, in Addition to his Fraud on the Court, Warrants Dismissal with Prejudice

Hargrove has not sufficiently rebutted the defendants' assertion of failure to exhaust, and a liberal reading of his submissions does not reveal any grounds to excuse that failure.

Because Hargrove filed a complaint in federal court before filing a grievance, permitting his unexhausted and unexcused claim to proceed would undercut one of the goals of the exhaustion doctrine by allowing NCCF to be haled into federal court without the "opportunity to correct

its own mistakes with respect to the programs it administers." <u>Woodford</u>, 126 S.Ct. at 2385. See also <u>Ruggiero</u>, 467 F.3d at 178 (citing <u>Porter</u>, 534 U.S. at 525). Thus, his complaint must be dismissed.

In general, dismissal without prejudice is appropriate where plaintiff has failed to exhaust but the time permitted for pursuing administrative remedies has not expired. Berry v. Kerik, 366 F.3d 85, 87 (2d Cir.2004). Dismissal with prejudice is appropriate where "administrative remedies have become unavailable after the prisoner had ample opportunity to use them and no special circumstances justified failure to exhaust." Berry, 366 F.3d at 88. Here, Hargrove's administrative remedies were available to him during his entire period of confinement at NCCF. He remained incarcerated in NCCF throughout the time period in which he alleges the PPD tests were given. He could have exhausted remedies for his grievances at any time. Therefore, Hargrove had ample opportunity to seek administrative remedies but failed to do so. Because there is no evidence in the record that administrative remedies are still available to Hargrove, as the five-day time period had run, and because Hargrove has alleged no special circumstances justifying his failure to exhaust, his complaint is accordingly dismissed with prejudice. Berry, 366 F.3d at 88 (upholding dismissal with prejudice where plaintiff had no justification for his failure to pursue administrative remedies while they were available.)

*11 Additionally, defendants' have moved for sanctions based on Hargrove's alleged submission of falsified evidence. If a party commits a fraud on the court, the court has the inherent power to do whatever is reasonably necessary to deter abuse of the judicial process. Shangold v. The Walt Disney Co., No. 03-CV-9522, 2006 WL 71672, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. January 12, 2006) (citing Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 44 (1991)). Fraud upon the court has been defined as "fraud which seriously affects the integrity of the normal process of adjudication." Gleason v. Jandrucko, 860 F.2d 556, 559 (2d Cir.1988); McMunn v. Mem'l Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, 191 F.Supp.2d 440, 445 (S.D.N.Y.2002). In order for a court to grant sanctions based upon fraud, it must be established by clear and convincing evidence that a party has "sentiently set in motion some unconscionable scheme calculated to interfere with the judicial system's ability impartially to adjudicate a matter by ... unfairly hampering

the presentation of the opposing party's claim or defense."

<u>McMunn</u>, 191 F.Supp.2d at 455 (quoting <u>Aoude v. Mobil</u>
<u>Oil Corp.</u>, 892 F.2d 1115, 1119 (1st Cir.1989).

After carefully reviewing the allegedly fraudulent documents, it must be concluded that Hargrove consciously falsified these documents. See, e.g., Shangold, 2006 WL 71672, at *1, *3 (finding clear and convincing evidence of fraud where plaintiffs fabricated a timeline and plot outlines to advance their claims); McMunn, 191 F.Supp.2d at 446 (finding clear and convincing evidence of fraud where plaintiff edited audio tapes and represented that they were unedited during discovery). The notaries performing services for prisoners at NCCF testify that they never notarized many of the documents supplied by Hargrove. See Klein Aff.; McDevitt Aff. Furthermore, a visual examination of the documents themselves makes it clear that many of the documents submitted by Hargrove are forgeries.

In considering what sanction to impose, courts consider the following five factors: (i) whether the misconduct was the product of intentional bad faith; (ii) whether and to what extent the misconduct prejudiced the plaintiffs; (iii) whether there was a pattern of misbehavior rather than an isolated instance; (iv) whether and when the misconduct was corrected; and (v) whether further misconduct is likely to occur in the future. <u>Scholastic, Inc. v. Stouffer, 221 F.Supp.2d 425, 444 (S.D.N.Y.2002)</u> (citing <u>McMunn, 191 F.Supp.2d at 461)</u>.

Here, Hargrove's deception was not an isolated instance; he fabricated the dates on many grievance forms, in addition to improperly duplicating notary stamps on complaint letters to make them look authentic. Klein Aff. at 2; McDevitt Aff. at 2; County Defs.' 56.1 Statement ¶¶ C3, D3. He submitted these forgeries to defendants during discovery and again as exhibits to his Affidavit in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. A severe sanction is warranted as Hargrove's forgeries were intentional, he never corrected them once their authenticity was challenged and he continues to insist on their veracity. Aff. in Opp. at 1-4. Given that there is clear and convincing evidence that Hargrove has continuously and consciously perpetrated a fraud on the court through his submission of fraudulent documents and sworn

affirmations of those documents' authenticity, dismissal with prejudice is especially appropriate. See, e.g., Shangold, 2006 WL 71672, at *5 (dismissing with prejudice where plaintiffs fabricated evidence to advance their claims); Scholastic, 221 F.Supp.2d at 439-444 (dismissing with prejudice where plaintiff produced seven pieces of falsified evidence); McMunn, 191 F.Supp.2d at 445 (dismissing with prejudice where plaintiff "lie[d] to the court and his adversary intentionally, repeatedly, and about issues that are central to the truth-finding process").

Conclusion

*12 Because Hargrove did not satisfy the exhaustion requirement under the PLRA, defendants' motions for summary judgment are granted. Further, considering the fraud Hargrove perpetrated on the court, the claims are dismissed against all defendants with prejudice. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the case.

SO ORDERED:

E.D.N.Y.,2007. Hargrove v. Riley Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2007 WL 389003 (E.D.N.Y.)

END OF DOCUMENT



Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2006 WL 2639369 (N.D.N.Y.) (Cite as: 2006 WL 2639369 (N.D.N.Y.))

C

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, N.D. New York. James PETTUS, Plaintiff,

Jospeh McCOY, Superintendent, Deputy Ryan, Defendants.

No. 9:04-CV-0471.

Sept. 13, 2006.

James Pettus, Comstock, NY, pro se.

<u>Charles J. Quackenbush</u>, New York State Attorney General, The Capitol Albany, NY, for Defendants.

DECISION and **ORDER**

THOMAS J. McAVOY, Senior District Judge.

*1 Plaintiff commenced the instant action asserting various violations of his constitutional rights arising out of his placement at the Southport Correctional Facility. In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he was improperly sent to the Special Housing Unit ("SHU") at a maximum security facility and that being in SHU has put his life in jeopardy. Currently before the Court is Defendants' motion for summary judgment pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P.56 seeking dismissal of the Complaint in its entirety for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

I. FACTS FN1

FN1. The following facts are taken from Defendants' statement of material facts submitted

pursuant to N.D.N.Y.L.R. 7.1(a)(3). These facts are deemed admitted because they are supported by the record evidence and Plaintiff failed to submit an opposing statement of material facts as required by Rule 7.1(a)(3). Plaintiff was specifically advised by Defendants of his obligation to file an opposing statement of material facts and to otherwise properly respond to the motion for summary judgment.

Plaintiff is an inmate in the custody of the New York State Department of Correctional Services. Plaintiff signed the instant Complaint on April 7, 2004. On his Complaint form, Plaintiff indicated that there is a grievance procedure available to him and that he availed himself of the grievance procedure by filing a complaint with the IGRC FN2, followed by an appeal to the superintendent of the facility, and then to the Central Office Review Committee in Albany. The Complaint indicates that Plaintiff is "waiting for response from Albany." The Complaint was filed on April 27, 2004.

FN2. Inmate Grievance Review Committee.

On April 12, 2004, prior to the filing of the instant Complaint, Plaintiff filed a grievance relating to the issues presented in this case. On April 19, 2004, the IGRC recommended that Plaintiff's grievance be denied. Plaintiff then appealed that decision to the facility Superintendent. In the meantime, on April 27, Plaintiff commenced the instant litigation. On May 3, 2004, after Plaintiff filed the Complaint in this case, the Superintendent denied Plaintiff's grievance. On May 5, 2004, Plaintiff appealed the decision to the Central Office Review Committee in Albany. On June 23, 2004, the Central Office Review Committee denied Plaintiff's appeal. Plaintiff did not file any other grievances in connection with the matters raised in this lawsuit.

Defendants now move to dismiss on the ground that Plaintiff commenced the instant action before fully exhausting his available administrative remedies. Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2006 WL 2639369 (N.D.N.Y.) (Cite as: 2006 WL 2639369 (N.D.N.Y.))

II. DISCUSSION

The sole issue presented is whether Plaintiff was required to complete the administrative process before commencing this litigation. This issue has already been addressed by the Second Circuit in <u>Neal v. Goord</u>, 267 F.3d 116 (2d Cir.2001). The issue in that case was "whether plaintiff's complaint should have been dismissed despite his having exhausted at least some claims during the pendency of his lawsuit." <u>Id.</u> at 121. The Second Circuit held that "exhausting administrative remedies after a complaint is filed will not save a case from dismissal." *Id*.

In this case, Defendants have established from a legally sufficient source that an administrative remedy is available and applicable. *Mojias v. Johnson*, 351 F.3d 606, 610 (2d Cir.2003); see also 7. N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.1, et seq. Plaintiff's Complaint concerns his placement in SHU at a maximum security facility. These are matters that fall within the grievance procedure available to NYSDOCS inmates and are required to be exhausted under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate any applicable exception to the exhaustion requirement. Because Plaintiff commenced the instant litigation prior to fully completing the administrative review process, the instant Complaint must be dismissed without prejudice. *Neal*, 267 F.3d 116.

III. CONCLUSION

*2 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED and the Complaint is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The Clerk of the Court shall close the file in this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

N.D.N.Y.,2006.
Pettus v. McCoy
Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2006 WL 2639369
(N.D.N.Y.)

END OF DOCUMENT



н

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, S.D. New York. William MINGUES, Plaintiff,

C.O NELSON and C.O. Berlingame, Defendants.

No. 96 CV 5396(GBD).

Feb. 20, 2004.

Background: Inmate brought a § 1983 action asserting, inter alia, claims of excessive force during his wife's visit with him at the correctional facility.

Holding: On a defense motion to dismiss, the District Court, <u>Daniels</u>, J., held that the record established that the action was filed after the effective date of the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA). Motion granted.

West Headnotes

Civil Rights 78 € 1395(7)

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General 78k1392 Pleading

78k1395 Particular Causes of Action

78k1395(7) k. Prisons and Jails; Probation

and Parole. Most Cited Cases

Record established that inmate's § 1983 action was filed after the effective date of the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996 (PLRA), such that the inmate's failure to exhaust his administrative remedies precluded relief; examination of the initial complaint itself, on its face, unequivocally demonstrated that the inmate's subsequent allegation in his amended complaint that he filed the complaint in April of

1996 was patently false; there was no explanation offered that could reasonably support and account for the existence of May dates on the complaint. 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act, § 7(a), 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e(a).

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER

DANIELS, J.

*1 This § 1983 action was originally commenced by the plaintiff, FNI a prisoner in New York State custody, and his wife claiming their civil rights were violated during the wife's visit with plaintiff at the correctional facility. Discovery in this matter has concluded. Previously, all claims asserted by plaintiff's wife were dismissed for failure to prosecute. Additionally, defendants' summary judgment motion was denied with respect to plaintiff's claims of excessive force, FN2 and summary judgment was granted dismissing all of plaintiff's other claims. Defendants now seek to dismiss the remaining excessive force claims on the grounds they are barred by the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act of 1996 ("PLRA"), 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), as plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies.

<u>FN1.</u> Plaintiff and his wife were proceeding *pro* se when they filed the complaint and amended complaint. Thereafter, plaintiff obtained legal representation.

FN2. In the amended complaint, plaintiff alleges he was beaten, kicked and punched. (Am.Compl. § 6). In his original complaint, he had also claimed that he was whipped." (Compl. at 7, 8). Plaintiff testified at his deposition that he was slapped once in the face, punched about four or five times in the lower back, and a correctional officer then laid on top of him. (Mingues Dep. at 78-81). The incident, which took approximately thirty to forty seconds, caused plaintiff to suffer from back pain for an unspecified period of time. (*Id.* at 81, 86).

Subdivision (a) of § 1997e provides, "[n]o action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." This provision became effective on April 26, 1996. Blisset v. Casey, 147 F.3d 218, 219 (2d Cir.1998). The PLRA's exhaustion requirement does not apply retroactively to actions pending when the Act was signed into law. Scott v. Coughlin, 344 F.3d 282, 291 (2d Cir.2003).

There is no dispute that plaintiff did not avail himself of the existing and available prison grievance procedure. Plaintiff, however, argues he was not required to exhaust his administrative remedies because, as alleged in his amended complaint, "petitioners (sic) had already filed in April 10-12 of 1996," prior to the PLRA's April 26, 1996 enactment date. [FN3] (Am.Compl. § 2). In order to determine the date that the instant action was commenced, the date of the filing of the amended complaint relates back to the filing date of the original complaint. Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(c). The original complaint was signed and dated by plaintiff's wife on May 8, 1996; it was stamped received by the Pro Se Office on May 10, 1996; and plaintiff's signature is dated May 13, 1996. FN4

FN3. The amended complaint reads as follows:

That the original complaint filed under and pursuant to <u>Title 42 section 1983</u> and <u>1985</u> was made and submitted before this court in April of 1996, before the application of the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act of 1996 was signed into law. The Act was signed into law April 26, 1996 and petitioners had already filed in April 10-12 of 1996. (Am.Compl. § 2).

FN4. Plaintiff's wife application for *in forma* pauperis relief was signed and dated May 8, 1996, and it is stamped as received by the Pro Se Office on May 10, 1996. Plaintiff's signature, on his initial application for appointment of counsel, is dated May 13, 1996, and it is stamped as

received by the Pro Se Office on May 10, 1996. Attached to plaintiff's application, is his signed Affirmation of Service, also dated May 13, 1996, wherein plaintiff declared under penalty of perjury that he served his application upon the Pro Se Office. Plaintiff alleges that "between April 17, 1996 until October 7, 1996," all visitation was suspended between him and his wife and that their "only form of communications was correspondence." (Am.Compl. § 7).

The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Pitman for a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). Although the magistrate judge found that the three earliest possible dates that the evidence demonstrates the complaint could have been filed, i.e., May 8th, 10th, and 13th of 1996, were all beyond the PLRA enactment date, he nevertheless recommended that the motion to dismiss be denied based on plaintiff's allegation in the amended complaint that he filed the original complaint April 10-12 of 1996, prior to the April 26, 1996 enactment date. The magistrate judge found that, "[i]n light of the express allegation in the Amended Complaint that plaintiff commenced the action before April 26, 1996 and the absence of a clear record to the contrary, the requirement that disputed factual issues be resolved in plaintiff's favor for purposes of this motion requires that the motion be denied." (Report at 12-13).

*2 Defendants object to the Report's conclusion that there is a material issue of fact regarding the date the action was filed. Plaintiff's attorney did not file any objections. FNS The Court must make a de novo determination as to those portions of the Report to which there are objections. Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). It is not required that the Court conduct a de novo hearing on the matter. United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 676, 100 S.Ct. 2406, 65 L.Ed.2d 424 (1980). Rather, it is sufficient that the Court "arrive at its own, independent conclusion" regarding those portions to which the objections were made. Nelson v. Smith, 618 F.Supp. 1186, 1189-90 (S.D.N.Y.1985) (quoting Hernandez v. Estelle, 711 F.2d 619, 620 (5th Cir.1983)). Accordingly, the Court, in the exercise of sound judicial discretion, must determine the extent, if any, it should rely upon the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations. Raddatz, 447 U.S. at 676. The Court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations set forth within the Report. Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. §

636(b)(1)(C). Where there are no objections, the Court may accept the Report provided there is no clear error on the face of the record. Nelson v. Smith, 618 F.Supp. at 1189; see also Heisler v. Kralik, 981 F.Supp. 830, 840 (S.D.N.Y.1997), aff'd sub nom. Heisler v. Rockland County, 164 F.3d 618 (2d Cir.1998).

FN5. Plaintiff himself filed objections which was not adopted by his counsel. Plaintiff objects to the magistrate judge's finding that an issue exists as to when plaintiff filed the complaint because plaintiff asserts he gave it to prison officials to be mailed in April. Additionally, plaintiff objects to the magistrate judge's suggestion that the defendants convert their motion to one for summary judgment asserting the same theory as set forth in the present motion. Since this Court finds that the instant motion is meritorious, the propriety of plaintiff personally submitting his own objections need not be address as those objections are moot.

Upon a de novo review, the Report's recommendation that the motion be denied is rejected by the Court. Section 1997e (a) requires that inmates exhaust all available administrative remedies prior to the commencement of a § 1983 action concerning prison conditions, and failure to do so warrants dismissal of the action. *Porter v. Nussel*, 534 U.S. 516, 122 S.Ct. 983, 152 L.Ed.2d 12 (2002); Scott, 344 F.3d at 290. The exhaustion of one's administrative remedies, however, is not a jurisdictional requirement under the PLRA. Richardson v. Goord, 347 F.3d 431 (2d Cir.2003). A defendant may assert a non-exhaustion claim as an affirmative defense. Jenkins v. Haubert, 179 F.3d 19, 28-29 (2d Cir.1999). Since it is an affirmative defense, defendants bear the burden of proof in this regard. See, McCoy v. Goord, 255 F.Supp.2d 233, 248 (S.D.N.Y.2003); Arnold v. Goetz, 245 F.Supp.2d 527, 534-35 (S.D.N.Y.2003); Reyes v. Punzal, 206 F.Supp.2d 431, 433 (W.D.N.Y.2002). A motion to dismiss, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6), is an appropriate vehicle to be used by a defendant where the failure to exhaust is clear from the face of the complaint as well as any written instrument attached as an exhibit and any statements or documents incorporated by reference into the complaint. See, Scott v. Gardner, 287 F.Supp.2d 477, 485 (S.D.N.Y.2003) (citation omitted); McCoy, 255 F.Supp.2d at 249.

In the amended complaint, plaintiff alleges, in a conclusory manner, that he filed the original complaint before the effective date of the PLRA, sometime between April 10th and April 12th of 1996. On a motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6), the court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint as true, and draw all reasonable inference in plaintiff's favor. Resnick v. Swartz, 303 F.3d 147, 150-51 (2d Cir.2002) (citation omitted); Bolt Elec., Inc. v. City of New York, 53 F.3d 465, 469 (2d Cir.1995). Dismissal is only warranted where it appears without doubt that plaintiff can prove no set of facts supporting his claims that would entitle him to relief. Harris v. City of New York, 186 F.3d 243, 247 (2d Cir.1999). The court's consideration is not limiting solely to the factual allegations set forth in the amended complaint. Rather, the court may also consider documents attached to the complaint as exhibits or incorporated in it by reference, matters of which judicial notice may be taken, or to documents either in plaintiff's possession or of which he has knowledge of and relied on in bringing the action. Brass v. American Film Technologies, Inc., 987 F.2d 142, 150 (2d Cir.1993) (citation omitted). The court is not bound to accept as true a conclusory allegation where the pleadings are devoid of any specific facts or circumstances supporting such an assertion. DeJesus v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., Inc., 87 F.3d 65, 70 (2d Cir.1996). Nor must the court "ignore any facts alleged in the complaint that undermine the plaintiff's claim." Roots Partnership v. Lands' End, Inc., 965 F.2d 1411, 1416 (7th Cir.1992) (citation omitted).

FN6. In response to then Chief Judge Thomas P. Griesa's 1996 order dismissing this action, plaintiff filed an Application for Reconsideration, dated October 28, 1996, wherein he claims that "on April 12, 1996 this petitioner filed a 1983 civil suit ..." (Pl.'s Mot. for Recons. at 1).

*3 Plaintiff fails to allege any factual basis in support of his claim that he filed the initial complaint between April 10-12, 1996. The Court is not required to accept this statement as a well-pleaded factual allegation in light of the existing record which clearly demonstrates that such an allegation is not only factually unsupported by the clear evidence, but is factually impossible. Generally, an

amended complaint supersedes the original complaint, and renders it of no legal effect. *In re. Crysen/Montenay Energy Co.*, 226 F.3d 160, 162 (2d Cir.2000). In plaintiffs amended complaint, he states that he is submitting the amended complaint in support of his original complaint. Hence, the original complaint is incorporated by reference in the amended complaint, and may be considered by the Court. Even if the initial complaint was not so incorporated, given the circumstances of this case, the Court would nevertheless consider it as it relates to the original date of filing. An examination of the initial complaint itself, on its face, unequivocally demonstrates that plaintiff's subsequent allegation in his amended complaint that he filed the complaint between April 10th and 12th of 1996 is patently false.

The original complaint refers to plaintiff's prison disciplinary hearing arising out of the same incident forming the basis of the present lawsuit. Generally, the disciplinary charges against plaintiff were in connection with an alleged conspiracy by him and his wife to commit grand larceny against inmate Robert Cornell. That hearing began on April 16, 1996, and concluded on April 19, 1996. (Defs.' Notice of Mot. for Summ. J. Ex. N, Transcript of Disciplinary Hr'g, conducted on April 16, 18-19, 1996). Specifically, in the original complaint, plaintiff refers to the testimony given by this fellow inmate. FN7 (Compl. at 8). That inmate testified on April 19th. (Hr'g. Tr. at 53-54, 57). Thus, plaintiff's claim that he filed the complaint between April 10-12, 1996, is absolutely impossible as the initial complaint refers to events occurring after that time period. Merely because plaintiff boldly alleges in his amended complaint that he filed the original complaint between April 10th and 12th does not require this Court to turn a blind eye to plaintiff's prior pleadings demonstrating the absurdity of his claim. FN8 See, Silva Run Worlwide Ltd. v. Gaming Lottery Corp., 2001 WL 396521, *1 (S.D.N.Y. April 19, 2001) (citations omitted) (A court should not "accept allegations that are contradicted or undermined by other more specific allegations in the complaint or by written materials properly before the court.").

FN7. In the complaint, plaintiff alleges "that at his S.H.U. hearing petitioner called as a witness Robert Cornell who stated that this petitioner Mingues nor his wife (co-petitioner) Narvaez ever took any money from him. (Compl. at 8).

<u>FN8.</u> At his deposition, plaintiff testified that he filed the initial complaint "[a]pproximately around June of 1996." (Mingues Dep. at 37-38).

Lawsuits by inmates represented by counsel are commenced when the complaint is filed with the court. See, Fed.R.Civ.P. 3, 5(e). For pro se litigants, who are not imprisoned and have been granted in forum pauperis relief, their complaints are deemed filed when received by the Pro Se Office. See, Toliver v. County of Sullivan, 841 F.2d 41 (2d Cir.1998). The complaint of a pro se prisoner, however, is deemed filed when he or she gives the complaint to prisoner officials to be mailed. Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 270, 108 S.Ct. 2379, 101 L.Ed.2d 245 (1988); *Dory v. Ryan*, 999 F.2d 679, 682 (2d Cir.1993), modified on other grounds, 25 F.3d 81 (2d Cir.1994). The "prison mailbox" rule is designed to combat inmate litigants' dependence on the prison facility's mail system and their lack of counsel so as to assure the timely filing of their legal papers with the court. Noble v. *Kelly*, 246 F.3d 93, 97 (2d Cir.2001) (citations omitted). Given the difficulty in determining when a prisoner relinquishes control of the complaint to prison personnel, the date the plaintiff signed the original complaint is presumed to be the date plaintiff gave the complaint to prison officials to be mailed. See e.g., Forster v. Bigger, 2003 WL 22299326, *2 (S.D.N.Y. Oct.7, 2003); Hosendove v. Myers, 2003 WL 22216809, *2 (D.Conn. Sept.19, 2003); Hayes v. N .Y.S. D.O.C. Officers, 1998 WL 901730, *3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec.28, 1998); Torres v. Irvin, 33 F.Supp.2d 257, 270 (S.D.N.Y.1998) (cases cited therein).

*4 In response to the Report and Recommendation, plaintiff asserts that, in April, the original complaint "was placed in the facility mail box." (Pl.'s Objection to Report at 1). However, it is uncontested that plaintiff's wife signed the complaint on May 8th; it was received by the Pro Se Office on May 10th; and plaintiff's signature is dated May 13th. There is no explanation offered that could reasonably support and account for the existence of these May dates on a complaint which plaintiff falsely claims to have deposited to be mailed during the period of April 10th and April 12th. Had plaintiff mailed the complaint directly to the court prior to April 26th, it would have been impossible for the plaintiff's wife to have signed the document two

days prior to the date that the Pro Se Office stamped it received on May 10th. Moreover, absent evidence to the contrary, applying the mailbox rule would presume that plaintiff gave his complaint to prison officials on May 13, 1996, the date he signed it. See, Johnson v. Coombe, 156 F.Supp.2d 273, 277 (S.D.N.Y.2001) (quoting Torres, 33 F.Supp.2d at 270). Even if the Court gave plaintiff the benefit of the date plaintiff's wife signed the complaint, i.e., the earliest date reflected on the filed complaint, it was still after the effective date of the PLRA. Hence, plaintiff is legally obligated to have pursued his prison grievance procedures prior to filing the instant action. The plaintiff has offered no explanation for the initial complaint's reference to events that occurred after the date he claims he filed it, the two May dates on which he and his former co-plaintiff wife signed the complaint, or the May date stamped received by the Pro Se Office. As the magistrate Judge observed:

<u>FN9.</u> The benefit of the mailbox rule does not apply where the plaintiff delivers the complaint to someone outside the prison system to forward to the court. <u>Knickerbocker v. Artuz</u>, 271 F.3d 35, 37 (2d Cir.2001).

Apart from the allegation that certain events giving rise to the claims occurred on April 9, 1996, the Original Complaint contains no mention of dates in April, 1996. Mingues no where explains the contradiction between the signature dates on the Original Complaint and the allegations contained in Amended Complaint. (Report at 12).

New York state law provides a three tier grievance procedure applicable to plaintiff's claims of excessive force. See, N.Y. Correct. Law § 139 (McKinnney's 2003); N.Y. Comp.Codes R. & Regs. tit. 7, § 701.7 (2003); Mendoz v. Goord, 2002 WL 31654855 (S.D.N.Y. Nov.21, 2002); Rodriguez v. Hahn, 209 F.Supp.2d 344 (S.D.N.Y.2002). Plaintiff has not denied knowledge of the grievance procedure at his institution, nor claimed that anything or anyone caused him not to file a grievance and completely pursue it through the administrative process. FN10 The magistrate judge's determination that the defendants' Rule 12(b) motion should be denied because of an "absence of a clear record" contrary to plaintiff's express allegation in the amended complaint that he

commenced the action before April 26, 1996 is erroneous. The Court could have *sua sponte* dismiss this action as the record is unmistakably clear that an appropriate administrative procedure was available to him, that he was required to exhaust his administrative remedies, and that he failed to do so as required by the PLRA. *See*, *Mojias v. Johnson*, 351 F.3d 606 (2003); *Snider v. Melindez*, 199 F.3d 108, 112-13 (2d Cir.1999). In this case, plaintiff has been afforded notice and given an opportunity to respond to the exhaustion issue and his failure remains clear.

FN10. In the original complaint, plaintiff stated he did not file a grievance, pursuant to the state's prisoner grievance procedure, "because this matter can not be dealt with by interdepartmental grievances." (Compl. at 2-3). In plaintiff's attorney's memorandum in opposition to the motion to dismiss, counsel contends that plaintiff is not required to file a grievance because the state's prison system provides extremely limited administrative remedies and money damages, which plaintiff seeks, are not available.

*5 Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation is not adopted; and it is further

ORDERED that the defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint is granted.

S.D.N.Y.,2004. Mingues v. Nelson Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2004 WL 324898 (S.D.N.Y.)

END OF DOCUMENT



Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2008 WL 2522324 (N.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2008 WL 2522324 (N.D.N.Y.))

н

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,

N.D. New York.
James MURRAY, Plaintiff,

V.

R. PALMER, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow
Correctional Facility; S. Griffin, Corrections Officer,
Great Meadow Correctional Facility; M. Terry,
Corrections Officer, Great Meadow Correctional
Facility; F. Englese, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow
Correctional Facility; Sergeant Edwards, Great Meadow
Correctional Facility; K. Bump, Sergeant, Great
Meadow Correctional Facility; K.H. Smith, Sergeant,
Great Meadow Correctional Facility; A. Paolano,
Facility Health Director: and Ted Nesmith, Physicians
Assistant, Defendants.

No. 9:03-CV-1010 (DNH/GLS).

June 20, 2008.

James Murray, Malone, NY, pro se.

Hon. Andrew M. Cuomo, Attorney General of the State of New York, <u>James Seaman</u>, Esq., Asst. Attorney General, of Counsel, Albany, NY, for Defendants.

ORDER

DAVID N. HURD, District Judge.

*1 Plaintiff, James Murray, brought this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In a 51 page Report Recommendation dated February 11, 2008, the Honorable George H. Lowe, United States Magistrate Judge, recommended that defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted in part (i.e., to the extent that it requests the dismissal with prejudice of plaintiff's claims against defendant Paolano and Nesmith); and denied in part (i.e., to the extent that it requests dismissal of plaintiff's claims against the remaining defendants on the grounds of plaintiff's failure to exhaust available administrative remedies) for the reasons stated in the

Report Recommendation. Lengthy objections to the Report Recommendation have been filed by the plaintiff.

Based upon a de novo review of the portions of the Report-Recommendation to which the plaintiff has objected, the Report-Recommendation is accepted and adopted. See 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1).

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that

- 1. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part;
- 2. Plaintiff's complaint against defendants Paolano and Nesmith is DISMISSED with prejudice;
- 3. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is DENIED, to the extent that their request for dismissal of plaintiff's assault claims under the Eighth Amendment against the remaining defendants on the grounds of plaintiff's failure to exhaust available administrative remedies as stated in the Report-Recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

JAMES MURRAY, Plaintiff,

-v.-

R. PALMER, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow C.F.; S. GRIFFIN, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow C.F.; M. TERRY, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow C.F.; F. ENGLESE, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow C.F.; P. EDWARDS, Sergeant, Great Meadow C.F.; K. BUMP, Sergeant, Great Meadow C.F.; K.H. SMITH, Sergeant, Great Meadow C.F.; A. PAOLANO, Health Director, Great Meadows C.F.; TED NESMITH, Physicians Assistant, Great Meadows C.F., Defendants.

R. PALMER, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow C.F.; S. GRIFFIN, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow C.F.; M. TERRY, Corrections Officer, Great Meadow

C.F.; Counter Claimants,

-v.-

JAMES MURRAY, Counter Defendant.

ORDER and REPORT-RECOMMENDATION

GEORGE H. LOWE, United States Magistrate Judge.

This *pro se* prisoner civil rights action, commenced pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, has been referred to me for Report and Recommendation by the Honorable David N. Hurd, United States District Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 72.3(c). Currently pending before the Court is Defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 78.) For the reasons that follow, I recommend that Defendants' motion be granted in part and denied in part.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint

In his Second Amended Complaint, James Murray ("Plaintiff") alleges that nine correctional officials and health care providers employed by the New York State Department of Correctional Services ("DOCS") at Great Meadow Correctional Facility ("Great Meadow C.F.") violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment on August 17, 2000, when (1) Defendants Palmers, Griffin, Terry, and Englese assaulted him without provocation while he was incapacitated by mechanical restraints, (2) Defendants Edwards, Bump, and Smith witnessed, but did not stop, the assault, and (3) Defendants Paolano and Nesmith failed to examine and treat him following the assault despite his complaints of having a broken wrist. (Dkt. No. 10, ¶¶ 6-7 [Plf.'s Second Am. Compl.].)

B. Defendants' Counterclaim

*2 In their Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, three of the nine Defendants (Palmer, Griffin and Terry) assert a counterclaim against Defendant for personal injuries they sustained as a result of Plaintiff's assault and battery upon them during the physical struggle that ensued between them and Plaintiff due to his threatening and violent behavior on August 17, 2000, at Great Meadow C.F. (Dkt. No. 35, Part 1, ¶ 23-30 [Defs.'

Answer & Counterclaim].)

I note that the docket in this action inaccurately indicates that this Counterclaim is asserted also on behalf of Defendants Englese, Edwards, Bump, Smith, Paolano, and "Nejwith" (later identified as "Nesmith"). (See Caption of Docket Sheet.) As a result, at the end of this Report-Recommendation, I direct the Clerk's Office to correct the docket sheet to remove the names of those individuals as "counter claimants" on the docket.

I note also that, while such counterclaims are unusual in prisoner civil rights cases (due to the fact that prisoners are often "judgment proof" since they are without funds), Plaintiff paid the \$150 filing fee in this action (Dkt. No. 1), and, in his Second Amended Complaint, he alleges that he received a settlement payment in another prisoner civil rights actions in 2002. (Dkt. No. 10, ¶ 10 [Plf.'s Second Am. Compl.].) Further investigation reveals that the settlement resulted in a payment of \$20,000 to Plaintiff. See Murray v. Westchester County Jail, 98-CV-0959 (S.D.N.Y.) (settled for \$20,000 in 2002).

II. DEFENDANTS' MOTION AND PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE

A. Defendants' Motion

In their motion for summary judgment, Defendants argue that Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint should be dismissed for four reasons: (1) Plaintiff has failed to adduce any evidence establishing that Defendant Paolano, a supervisor, was personally involved in any of the constitutional violations alleged; (2) Plaintiff has failed to adduce any evidence establishing that Defendant Nesmith was deliberately indifferent to any of Plaintiff's serious medical needs; (3) at the very least, Defendant Nesmith is protected from liability by the doctrine of qualified immunity, as a matter of law; and (4) Plaintiff has failed to adduce any evidence establishing that he exhausted his available administrative remedies with respect to his assault claim, before filing that claim in federal court. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 13, at 2, 4-13 [Defs.' Mem. of Law].)

In addition, Defendants argue that, during his deposition in this action, Plaintiff asserted, for the first time, a claim that the medical staff at Great Meadow C.F. violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment by failing

to honor non-life-sustaining medical prescriptions written at a former facility. (Id. at 3.) As a threshold matter, Defendants argue, this claim should be dismissed since Plaintiff never included the claim in his Second Amended Complaint, nor did Plaintiff ever file a motion for leave to file a Third Amended Complaint. (Id.) In any event, Defendants argue, even if the Court were to reach the merits of this claim, the Court should dismiss the claim because Plaintiff has failed to allege facts plausibly suggesting, or adduce evidence establishing, that Defendants were personally involved in the creation or implementation of DOCS' prescription-review policy, nor has Plaintiff provided such allegations or evidence indicating the policy is even unconstitutional. (Id.)

*3 Defendants' motion is accompanied by a Statement of Material Facts, submitted in accordance with Local Rule 7.1(a)(3) ("Rule 7.1 Statement"). (Dkt. No. 78, Part 12.) Each of the 40 paragraphs contained in Defendants' Rule 7.1 Statement is supported by an accurate citation to the record evidence. (*Id.*) It is worth mentioning that the record evidence consists of (1) the affirmations of Defendants Nesmith and Paolano, and exhibits thereto, (2) the affirmation of the Inmate Grievance Program Director for DOCS, and exhibits thereto, (3) affirmation of the Legal Liaison between Great Meadow C.F. and the New York State Attorney General's Office during the time in question, and exhibits thereto, and (4) a 155-page excerpt from Plaintiff's deposition transcript. (Dkt. No. 78.)

B. Plaintiff's Response

After being specifically notified of the consequences of failing to properly respond to Defendants' motion (see Dkt. No. 78, Part 1), and after being granted three extensions of the deadline by which to do so (see Dkt. Nos. 79, 80, 83), Plaintiff submitted a barrage of documents: (1) 49 pages of exhibits, which are attached to neither an affidavit nor a memorandum of law (Dkt. No. 84); (2) 113 pages of exhibits, attached to a 25-page affidavit (Dkt. No. 85); (3) 21 pages of exhibits, attached to a 12-page supplemental affidavit (Dkt. No. 86); and (4) a 29-page memorandum of law (Dkt. No. 86); and a 13-page supplemental memorandum of law (Dkt. No. 88).

Generally in his Memorandum of Law and Supplemental Memorandum of Law, Plaintiff responds to

the legal arguments advanced by Defendants. (See Dkt. No. 86, Plf.'s Memo. of Law [responding to Defs.' exhaustion argument]; Dkt. No. 88, at 7-13 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law, responding to Defs.' arguments regarding the personal involvement of Defendant Paolano, the lack of evidence supporting a deliberate indifference claim against Defendant Nesmith, the applicability of the qualified immunity defense with regard to Plaintiff's claim against Defendant Nesmith, and the sufficiency and timing of Plaintiff's prescription-review claim against Defendant Paolano].) Those responses are described below in Part IV of this Report-Recommendation.

However, unfortunately, not among the numerous documents that Plaintiff has provided is a proper response to Defendants' Rule 7.1 Statement. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 45-52 [Ex. N to Plf.'s Affid.].) Specifically, Plaintiff's Rule 7.1 Response (which is buried in a pile of exhibits) fails, with very few exceptions, to "set forth ... specific citation[s] to the record," as required by Local Rule 7.1(a)(3). (Id.) I note that the notary's "sworn to" stamp at the end of the Rule 7.1. Statement does not transform Plaintiff's Rule 7.1 Response into record evidence so as to render that Response compliant with Local Rule 7.1. First, Local Rule 7.1 expressly states, "The record for purposes of the Statement of Material Facts includes the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, admissions and affidavits." N.D.N.Y. L.R. 7.1(a)(3). In this way, the District's Local Rule, like similar local rules of other districts, contemplates citations to a record that is independent of a Rule 7.1 Response. See, e.g., Vaden v. GAP, Inc., 06-CV-0142, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22736, at *3-5, 2007 WL 954256 (M.D.Tenn. March 26, 2007) (finding non-movant's verified response to movant's statement of material facts to be deficient because it did cite to affidavit or declaration, nor did it establish that non-movant had actual knowledge of matters to which he attested); Waterhouse v. District of Columbia, 124 F.Supp.2d 1, 4-5 (D.D.C.2000) (criticizing party's "Verified Statement of Material Facts," as being deficient in citations to independent record evidence, lacking "firsthand knowledge," and being purely "self-serving" in nature). Moreover, many of Plaintiff's statements in his Rule 7.1 Response are either argumentative in nature or lacking in specificity and personal knowledge, so as to disqualify those statements from having the effect of

sworn testimony for purposes of a summary judgment motion. See, infra, notes 10-12 of this Report-Recommendation.

III. GOVERNING LEGAL STANDARD

*4 Under Fed.R.Civ.P. 56, summary judgment is warranted if "the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c). In determining whether a genuine issue of material fact exists, FNI the Court must resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences against the moving party. FN2

<u>FN1.</u> A fact is "material" only if it would have some effect on the outcome of the suit. <u>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby</u>, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986).

FN2. Schwapp v. Town of Avon, 118 F.3d 106, 110 (2d Cir.1997) [citation omitted]; Thompson v. Gjivoje, 896 F.2d 716, 720 (2d Cir.1990) [citation omitted].

However, when the moving party has met its initial burden of establishing the absence of any genuine issue of material fact, the nonmoving party must come forward with "specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial." FN3 The nonmoving party must do more than "rest upon the mere allegations ... of the [plaintiff's] pleading" or "simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts." FN4 Rather, "[a] dispute regarding a material fact is *genuine* if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." FN5

FN3. Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(e) ("When a motion for summary judgment is made [by a defendant] and supported as provided in this rule, the [plaintiff] may not rest upon the mere allegations ... of the [plaintiffs] pleading, but the [plaintiffs] response, by affidavits or as otherwise provided in this rule, must set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial. If the [plaintiff] does not so respond, summary

judgment, if appropriate, shall be entered against the [plaintiff]."); see also <u>Matsushita Elec.</u> <u>Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 585-87, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986).</u>

FN4. Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(e) ("When a motion for summary judgment is made [by a defendant] and supported as provided in this rule, the [plaintiff] may not rest upon the mere allegations ... of the [plaintiff's] pleading ..."); Matsushita, 475 U.S. at 585-86; see also Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986).

FN5. Ross v. McGinnis, 00-CV-0275, 2004 WL 1125177, at *8 (W.D.N.Y. Mar.29, 2004) [internal quotations omitted] [emphasis added].

What this burden-shifting standard means when a plaintiff has failed to *properly* respond to a defendant's Rule 7.1 Statement of Material Facts is that the facts as set forth in that Rule 7.1 Statement will be accepted as true FN6 to the extent that (1) those facts are supported by the evidence in the record, FN7 and (2) the non-moving party, if he is proceeding *pro se*, has been specifically advised of the potential consequences of failing to respond to the movant's motion for summary judgment. FN8

FN6. See N.D.N.Y. L.R. 7.1(a)(3) ("Any facts set forth in the Statement of Material Facts shall be deemed admitted unless specifically controverted by the opposing party.") [emphasis in original].

FN7. See Vermont Teddy Bear Co., Inc. v. 1-800 Beargram Co., 373 F.3d 241, 243 (2d Cir.2004) ("[I]n determining whether the moving party has met [its] burden of showing the absence of a genuine issue for trial, the district court may not rely solely on the statement of undisputed facts contained in the moving party's Rule 56.1 Statement. It must be satisfied that the citation to evidence in the record supports the assertion.") [internal quotation marks and citations omitted].

FN8. See Champion v. Artuz, 76 F.3d 483, 486 (2d Cir.1996); cf. N.D.N.Y. L.R. 56.2 (imposing on movant duty to provide such notice to pro se opponent).

Implied in the above-stated standard is the fact that a district court has no duty to perform an independent review of the record to find proof of a factual dispute, even if the non-movant is proceeding pro se. FN9 In the event the district court chooses to conduct such an independent review of the record, any affidavit submitted by the non-movant, in order to be sufficient to create a factual issue for purposes of a summary judgment motion, must, among other things, not be conclusory. FN10 (An affidavit is conclusory if, for example, its assertions lack any supporting evidence or are too general.) Finally, even where an affidavit is nonconclusory, it may be insufficient to create a factual issue where it is (1) "largely unsubstantiated by any other direct evidence" and (2) "so replete with inconsistencies and improbabilities that no reasonable juror would undertake the suspension of disbelief necessary to credit the allegations made in the complaint." FN12

> FN9. See Amnesty Am. v. Town of W. Hartford, 288 F.3d 467, 470 (2d Cir.2002) ("We agree with those circuits that have held that Fed.R.Civ.P. 56 does not impose an obligation on a district court to perform an independent review of the record to find proof of a factual dispute.") [citations omitted]; accord, Lee v. Alfonso, No. 04-1921, 2004 U.S.App. LEXIS 21432, 2004 WL 2309715 (2d Cir. Oct. 14, 2004), aff'g, 97-CV-1741, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20746, at *12-13 (N.D.N .Y. Feb. 10, 2004) (Scullin, J.) (granting motion for summary judgment); Fox v. Amtrak, 04-CV-1144, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9147, at *1-4, 2006 WL 395269 (N.D.N.Y. Feb. 16, 2006) (McAvoy, J.) (granting motion for summary judgment); Govan v. Campbell, 289 F.Supp.2d 289, 295 (N.D.N.Y. Oct.29, 2003) (Sharpe, M.J.) (granting motion for summary judgment); Prestopnik v. Whelan, 253 F.Supp.2d 369, 371-372 (N.D.N.Y.2003) (Hurd, J.).

FN10. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(e) (requiring that non-movant "set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial"); Patterson, 375 F.3d at 219 (2d. Cir.2004) ("Nor is a genuine issue created merely by the presentation of assertions [in an affidavit] that are conclusory.") [citations omitted]; Applegate v. Top Assoc., 425 F.2d 92, 97 (2d Cir.1970) (stating that the purpose of Rule 56[e] is to "prevent the exchange of affidavits on a motion for summary judgment from degenerating into mere elaboration of conclusory pleadings").

FN11. See, e.g., Bickerstaff v. Vassar Oil, 196 F.3d 435, 452 (2d Cir.1998) (McAvoy, C.J., sitting by designation) ("Statements [for example, those made in affidavits, deposition testimony or trial testimony] that are devoid of any specifics, but replete with conclusions, are insufficient to defeat a properly supported motion for summary judgment.") [citations omitted]; West-Fair Elec. Contractors v. Aetna Cas. & Sur., 78 F.3d 61, 63 (2d Cir.1996) (rejecting affidavit's conclusory statements that, in essence, asserted merely that there was a dispute between the parties over the amount owed to the plaintiff under a contract); Meiri v. Dacon, 759 F.2d 989, 997 (2d Cir.1985) (plaintiff's allegation that she "heard disparaging remarks about Jews, but, of course, don't ask me to pinpoint people, times or places.... It's all around us" was conclusory and thus insufficient to satisfy the requirements of Rule 56[e]); Applegate, 425 F.2d at 97 ("[Plaintiff] has provided the court [through his affidavit] with the characters and plot line for a novel of intrigue rather than the concrete particulars which would entitle him to a trial.").

FN12. See, e.g., Jeffreys v. City of New York, 426 F.3d 549, 554-55 (2d Cir.2005) (affirming grant of summary judgment to defendants in part because plaintiff's testimony about an alleged assault by police officers was "largely unsubstantiated by any other direct evidence" and was "so replete with inconsistencies and

improbabilities that no reasonable juror would undertake the suspension of disbelief necessary to credit the allegations made in the complaint") [citations and internal quotations omitted]; Argus, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co., 801 F.2d 38, 45 (2d Cir.1986) (affirming grant of summary judgment to defendants in part because plaintiffs' deposition testimony regarding an alleged defect in a camera product line was, although specific, "unsupported by documentary or other concrete evidence" and thus "simply not enough to create a genuine issue of fact in light of the evidence to the contrary"); Allah v. Greiner, 03-CV-3789, 2006 WL 357824, at *3-4 & n. 7, 14, 16, 21 (S.D.N.Y. Feb.15, 2006) (prisoner's verified complaint, which recounted specific statements by defendants that they were violating his rights, was conclusory and discredited by the evidence, and therefore insufficient to create issue of fact with regard to all but one of prisoner's claims, although verified complaint was sufficient to create issue of fact with regard to prisoner's claim of retaliation against one defendant because retaliatory act occurred on same day as plaintiff's grievance against that defendant, whose testimony was internally inconsistent and in conflict with other evidence); Olle v. Columbia Univ., 332 F.Supp.2d 599, 612 (S.D.N.Y.2004) (plaintiff's deposition testimony was insufficient evidence to oppose defendants' motion for summary judgment where that testimony recounted specific allegedly sexist remarks that "were either unsupported by admissible evidence or benign"), aff'd, 136 F. App'x 383 (2d Cir.2005) (unreported decision, cited not as precedential authority but merely to show the case's subsequent history, in accordance with Second Circuit Local Rule § 0.23).

IV. ANALYSIS

A. Whether Plaintiff Has Adduced Evidence Establishing that Defendant Paolano Was Personally Involved in the Constitutional Violations Alleged

" '[P]ersonal involvement of defendants in alleged constitutional deprivations is a prerequisite to an award of

damages under § 1983.' " Wright v. Smith, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir.1994) (quoting Moffitt v. Town of Brookfield, 950 F.2d 880, 885 [2d Cir.1991]). FN13 In order to prevail on a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against an individual, a plaintiff must show some tangible connection between the alleged unlawful conduct and the defendant. FN14 If the defendant is a supervisory official, such as a correctional facility superintendent or a facility health services director, a mere "linkage" to the unlawful conduct through "the prison chain of command" (i.e., under the doctrine of respondeat superior) is insufficient to show his or her personal involvement in that unlawful conduct. FN15 In other words, supervisory officials may not be held liable merely because they held a position of authority. FN16 Rather, supervisory personnel may be considered "personally involved" only if they (1) directly participated in the violation, (2) failed to remedy that violation after learning of it through a report or appeal, (3) created, or allowed to continue, a policy or custom under which the violation occurred, (4) had been grossly negligent in managing subordinates who caused the violation, or (5) exhibited deliberate indifference to the rights of inmates by failing to act on information indicating that the violation was occurring. FN17

> FN13. Accord, McKinnon v. Patterson, 568 F.2d 930, 934 (2d Cir.1977), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 1087, 98 S.Ct. 1282, 55 L.Ed.2d 792 (1978); Gill v. Mooney, 824 F.2d 192, 196 (2d Cir.1987).

<u>FN14.</u> <u>Bass v. Jackson,</u> 790 F.2d 260, 263 (2d Cir.1986).

FN15. Polk County v. Dodson, 454 U.S. 312, 325, 102 S.Ct. 445, 70 L.Ed.2d 509 (1981); Richardson v. Goord, 347 F.3d 431, 435 (2d Cir.2003); Wright, 21 F.3d at 501; Ayers v. Coughlin, 780 F.2d 205, 210 (2d Cir.1985).

FN16. *Black v. Coughlin*, 76 F.3d 72, 74 (2d Cir.1996).

FN17. Colon v. Coughlin, 58 F.3d 865, 873 (2d Cir.1995) (adding fifth prong); Wright, 21 F.3d at 501 (adding fifth prong); Williams v. Smith,

781 F.2d 319, 323-324 (2d Cir.1986) (setting forth four prongs).

*5 Defendants argue that Plaintiff has not adduced evidence establishing that Defendant Paolano, the Great Meadow C.F. Health Services Director during the time in question, was personally involved in the constitutional violations alleged. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 13, at 2 [Defs.' Memo. of Law].) In support of this argument, Defendants point to the record evidence establishing that, during the time in which Plaintiff was incarcerated at Great Meadow C.F. (i . e., from early August of 2000 to late November of 2000), Defendant Paolano never treated Plaintiff for any medical condition, much less a broken wrist on August 17, 2000. (*Id.; see also* Dkt. No. 78, Part 4, ¶¶ 7-8 [Paolano Affid.]; Dkt. No. 78, Part 5 [Ex. A to Paolano Affid.]; Dkt. No. 78, Part 11, at 32-33 [Plf.'s Depo.].)

Plaintiff responds that (1) Defendant Paolano was personally involved since he "treated" Plaintiff on August 17, 2000, by virtue of his supervisory position as the Great Meadow C.F.'s Health Services Director, and (2) Defendant Paolano has the "final say" regarding what medications inmates shall be permitted to retain when they transfer into Great Meadow C.F. (Dkt. No. 88, at 7-8 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law].) In support of this argument, Plaintiff cites a paragraph of his Supplemental Affidavit, and an administrative decision, for the proposition that Defendant Paolano, as the Great Meadow C.F. Health Services Director, had the "sole responsibility for providing treatment to the inmates under [the Facility's] care." (Id.; see also Dkt. No. 86, Suppl. Affid., ¶ 5 & Ex. 14.)

1. Whether Defendant Paolano Was Personally Involved in Plaintiff's Treatment on August 17, 2000

With respect to Plaintiff's first point (regarding Defendant Paolano's asserted "treatment" of Plaintiff on August 17, 2000), the problem with Plaintiff's argument is that the uncontrovered record evidence establishes that, as Defendants' assert, Defendant Paolano did not, in fact, treat Plaintiff on August 17, 2000 (or at any time when Plaintiff was incarcerated at Great Meadow C.F.). This was the fact asserted by Defendants in Paragraphs 38 of their Rule 7.1 Statement. (See Dkt. No. 78, Part 12, ¶ 38 [Defs.' Rule 7.1 Statement].) Defendants supported this

factual assertion with record evidence. (Id. [providing accurate record citations]; see also Dkt. No. 78, Part 12, ¶¶ 37-38 [Defs.' Rule 7.1 Statement, indicating that it was Defendant Nesmith, not Defendant Paolano, who treated Plaintiff on 8/17/00].) Plaintiff has failed to specifically controvert this factual assertion, despite having been given an adequate opportunity to conduct discovery, and having been specifically notified of the consequences of failing to properly respond to Defendants' motion (see Dkt. No. 78, Part 1), and having been granted three extensions of the deadline by which to do so (see Dkt. Nos. 79, 80, 83). Specifically, Plaintiff fails to cite any record evidence in support of his denial of Defendants' referenced factual assertion. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 50 [Ex. N to Plf.'s Affid.].) As a result, under the Local Rules of Practice for this Court, Plaintiff has effectively "admitted" Defendants' referenced factual assertions. N.D.N.Y. L.R. 7.1(a)(3).

*6 The Court has no duty to perform an independent review of the record to find proof disputing this established fact. See, supra, Part III and note 9 of this Report-Recommendation. Moreover, I decline to exercise my discretion, and I recommend that the Court decline to exercise its discretion, to perform an independent review of the record to find such proof for several reasons, any one of which is sufficient reason to make such a decision: (1) as an exercise of discretion, in order to preserve judicial resources in light of the Court's heavy caseload; (2) the fact that Plaintiff has already been afforded considerable leniency in this action, including numerous deadline extensions and liberal constructions; and (3) the fact that Plaintiff is fully knowledgeable about the requirements of a non-movant on a summary judgment motion, due to Defendants' notification of those requirements, and due to Plaintiff's extraordinary litigation experience.

With regard to this last reason, I note that federal courts normally treat the papers filed by *pro se* civil rights litigants with special solicitude. This is because, generally, *pro se* litigants are unfamiliar with legal terminology and the litigation process, and because the civil rights claims they assert are of a very serious nature. However, "[t]here are circumstances where an overly litigious inmate, who is quite familiar with the legal system and with pleading requirements, may not be afforded [the] special solicitude" that is normally afforded *pro se* litigants. FNI8 Generally, the

rationale for diminishing special solicitude (at least in the Second Circuit) is that the *pro se* litigant's extreme litigiousness demonstrates his *experience*, the lack of which is the reason for extending special solicitude to a *pro se* litigant in the first place. FN19 The Second Circuit has diminished this special solicitude, and/or indicated the acceptability of such a diminishment, on several occasions. FN20 Similarly, I decide to do so, here, and I recommend the Court do the same.

FN18. Koehl v. Greene, 06-CV-0478, 2007 WL 2846905, at *3 & n. 17 (N.D.N.Y. Sept.26, 2007) (Kahn, J., adopting Report-Recommendation) [citations omitted].

<u>FN19.</u> <u>Koehl,</u> 2007 WL 2846905, at *3 & n. 18 [citations omitted].

FN20. See, e.g., Johnson v. Eggersdorf, 8 F. App'x 140, 143 (2d Cir.2001) (unpublished opinion), aff'g, 97-CV-0938, Decision and Order (N.D.N.Y. filed May 28, 1999) (Kahn, J.), adopting, Report-Recommendation, at 1, n. 1 (N.D.N.Y. filed Apr. 28, 1999) (Smith, M.J.); Johnson v. C. Gummerson, 201 F.3d 431, at *2 (2d Cir.1999) (unpublished opinion), aff'g, 97-CV-1727, Decision and Order (N.D.N.Y. filed June 11, 1999) (McAvoy, J.), adopting, Report-Recommendation (N.D.N.Y. filed April 28, 1999) (Smith, M.J.); *Davidson v. Flynn*, 32 F.3d 27, 31 (2d Cir.1994); see also Raitport v. <u>Chem. Bank,</u> 74 F.R.D. 128, 133 (S.D.N.Y.1977)[citing Ackert v. Bryan, No. 27240 (2d Cir. June 21, 1963) (Kaufman, J., concurring).

Plaintiff is no stranger to the court system. A review of the Federal Judiciary's Public Access to Court Electronic Records ("PACER") System reveals that Plaintiff has filed at least 15 other federal district court actions, FN21 and at least three federal court appeals. FN22 Furthermore, a review of the New York State Unified Court System's website reveals that he has filed at least 20 state court actions, FN23 and at least two state court appeals. FN24 Among these many actions he has had at least one victory, resulting in the payment of \$20,000 to him in

settlement proceeds. FN25

FN21. See Murray v. New York, 96-CV-3413 (S.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Westchester County Jail, 98-CV-0959 (S.D.N.Y.); Murray v. McGinnis, 99-CV-1908 (W.D.N.Y.); Murray v. McGinnis, 99-CV-2945 (S.D.N.Y.); Murray v. McGinnis, 00-CV-3510 (S.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Jacobs, 04-CV-6231 (W.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Bushey, 04-CV-0805 (N.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Goord, 05-CV-1113 (N.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Wissman, 05-CV-1186 (N.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Goord, 05-CV-1579 (N.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Doe, 06-CV-0205 (S.D.N.Y.); Murray v. O'Herron, 06-CV-0793 (W.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Goord, 06-CV-1445 (N.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Fisher, 07-CV-0306 (W.D.N.Y.); Murray v. Escrow, 07-CV-0353 (W.D.N.Y.).

FN22. See Murray v. McGinnis, No. 01-2533 (2d Cir.); Murray v. McGinnis, No. 01-2536 (2d Cir.); Murray v. McGinnis, No. 01-2632 (2d Cir.).

FN23. See Murray v. Goord, Index No. 011568/1996 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Westchester County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002383/1997 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002131/1998 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002307/1998 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002879/1998 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002683/2004 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002044/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. McGinnis, Index No. 002099/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Sullivan, Index No. 002217/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002421/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002495/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002496/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Goord, Index No. 002888/2006 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung

County); Murray v. LeClaire, Index No. 002008/2007 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. LeClaire, Index No. 002009/2007 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. LeClaire, Index No. 002010/2007 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. LeClaire, Index No. 002011/2007 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. Fisher, Index No. 002762/2007 (N.Y. Sup.Ct., Chemung County); Murray v. New York, Claim No. Claim No. 108304, Motion No. 67679 (N.Y.Ct.Cl.); Murray v. New York, Motion No. M-67997 (N.Y.Ct.Cl.).

FN24. See Murray v. Goord, No. 84875, 709 N.Y. S.2d 662 (N.Y.S.App.Div., 3d Dept.2000); Murray v. Goord, No. 83252, 694 N.Y.S. 2d 797 (N.Y.S.App.Div., 3d Dept.1999).

FN25. See Murray v. Westchester County Jail, 98-CV-0959 (S.D.N.Y.) (settled for \$20,000 in 2002).

I will add only that, even if I were inclined to conduct such an independent review of the record, the record evidence that Plaintiff cites regarding this issue in his Supplemental Memorandum of Law does not create such a question of fact. (See Dkt. No. 88, at 7-8 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law, citing Dkt. No. 86, Suppl. Affid., ¶ 5 & Ex. 14].) It appears entirely likely that Defendant Paolano had the ultimate responsibility for providing medical treatment to the inmates at Great Meadow C.F. FN26 However, this duty arose solely because of his supervisory position, i.e., as the Facility Health Services Director. It is precisely this sort of supervisory duty that does not result in liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as explained above.

FN26. To the extent that Plaintiff relies on this evidence to support the proposition that Defendant Paolano had the "sole" responsibility for such health care, that reliance is misplaced. Setting aside the loose nature of the administrative decision's use of the word "sole," and the different context in which that word was used (regarding the review of Plaintiff's grievance about having had his prescription

discontinued), the administrative decision's rationale for its decision holds no preclusive effect in this Court. I note that this argument by Plaintiff, which is creative and which implicitly relies on principles of estoppel, demonstrates his facility with the law due to his extraordinary litigation experience.

*7 As for the other ways through which a supervisory official may be deemed "personally involved" in a constitutional violation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff does not even argue (or allege facts plausibly suggesting) FN27 that Defendant Paolano failed to remedy the alleged deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's serious medical needs on August 17, 2000, after learning of that deliberate indifference through a report or appeal. Nor does Plaintiff argue (or allege facts plausibly suggesting) that Defendant Paolano created, or allowed to continue, a policy or custom under which the alleged deliberate indifference on August 17, 2000, occurred. Nor does Plaintiff argue (or allege facts plausibly suggesting) that Defendant Paolano had been grossly negligent in managing subordinates (such as Defendant Nesmith) who caused the alleged deliberate indifference. Nor does Plaintiff argue (or allege facts plausibly suggesting) that Defendant Paolano exhibited deliberate indifference to the rights of Plaintiff by failing to act on information indicating that Defendant Nesmith was violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights.

> FN27. See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, --- U.S. ----, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1965, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007) (holding that, for a plaintiff's complaint to state a claim upon which relief might be granted under Fed.R.Civ.P. 8 and 12, his "[f]actual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level [to a plausible level]," or, in other words, there must be "plausible grounds to infer [actionable conduct]"), accord, Iqbal v. Hasty, 490 F.3d 143, 157-58 (2d Cir.2007) ("[W]e believe the [Supreme] Court [in Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly] is ... requiring a flexible 'plausibility standard,' which obliges a pleader to amplify a claim with some factual allegations in those contexts where such amplification is needed to render the claim plausible.") [emphasis in

original].

In the alternative, I reach the same conclusion (that Plaintiff's claim against Defendant Paolano arising from the events of August 17, 2000, lacks merit) on the ground that there was no constitutional violation committed by Defendant Nesmith on August 17, 2000, in which Defendant Paolano could have been personally involved, for the reasons discussed below in Part IV.B. of this Report-Recommendation.

2. Whether Defendant Paolano Was Personally Involved in the Review of Plaintiff's Prescriptions in Early August of 2000

With respect to Plaintiff's second point (regarding Defendant Paolano's asserted "final say" regarding what medications inmates shall be permitted to retain when they transfer into Great Meadow C.F.), there are three problems with this argument.

First, the argument regards a claim that is not properly before this Court for the reasons explained below in Part IV.E. of this Report-Recommendation.

Second, as Defendants argue, even if the Court were to reach the merits of this claim, it should rule that Plaintiff has failed to adduce evidence establishing that Defendant Paolano was personally involved in the creation or implementation of DOCS' prescription-review policy. It is an uncontrovered fact, for purposes of Defendants' motion, that (1) the decision to temporarily deprive Plaintiff of his previously prescribed pain medication (i.e., pending the review of that medication by a physician at Great Meadow C.F.) upon his arrival at Great Meadow C.F. was made by an "intake nurse," not by Defendant Paolano, (2) the nurse's decision was made pursuant to a policy instituted by DOCS, not by Defendant Paolano, and (3) Defendant Paolano did not have the authority to alter that policy. These were the facts asserted by Defendants in Paragraphs 6 through 9 of their Rule 7.1 Statement. (See Dkt. No. 78, Part 12, ¶¶ 6-9 [Defs.' Rule 7.1 Statement].) Defendants supported these factual assertions with record evidence. (Id. [providing accurate record citations].) Plaintiff expressly admits two of these factual assertions, and fails to support his denial of the remaining factual assertions with citations to record evidence that actually controverts the facts asserted. (Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at

46-47 [Ex. N to Plf.'s Affid.].)

*8 For example, in support of his denial of Defendants' factual assertion that "[t]his policy is not unique to Great Meadow, but applies to DOCS facilities generally," Plaintiff says that, at an unidentified point in time, "Downstate CF honored doctors proscribed [sic] treatment and filled by prescriptions from Southport Correctional Facility Also I've been transferred to other prisons such as Auburn [C.F.] in which they honored doctors prescribe[d] orders." (Id.) I will set aside the fact that Defendants' factual assertion is not that the policy applies to every single DOCS facility but that it applies to them as a general matter. I will also set aside the fact that Plaintiff's assertion is not supported by a citation to independent record evidence. The main problem with this assertion is that it is not specific as to what year or years he had these experiences, nor does it even say that his prescriptions were immediately honored without a review by a physician at the new facility.

The other piece of "evidence" Plaintiff cites in support of this denial is "Superintendent George B. Duncan's 9/22/00 decision of Appeal to him regarding [Plaintiff's Grievance No.] GM-30651-00." (Id.) The problem is that the referenced determination states merely that Defendant Paolano, as the Great Meadow C.F. Health Services Director, had the "sole responsibility for providing treatment to the inmates under [the Facility's] care, and has the final say regarding all medical prescriptions." (Dkt. No. 86, at 14 [Ex. 14 to Plf.'s Suppl. Affid.].) For the sake of much-needed brevity, I will set aside the issue of whether an IGP Program Director's broadly stated rationale for an appellate determination with respect to a prisoner's grievance can ever constitute evidence sufficient to create proof of a genuine issue of fact for purposes of a summary judgment motion. The main problem with this "evidence" is that there is absolutely nothing inconsistent between (1) a DOCS policy to temporarily deprive prisoners of non-life-sustaining prescription medications upon their arrival at a correctional facility, pending the review of those medical prescriptions by a physician at the facility, and (2) a DOCS policy to give Facility Health Service Directors the "final say" regarding the review of those medical prescriptions.

Because Plaintiff has failed to support his denial of these factual assertions with citations to record evidence that actually controverts the facts asserted, I will consider the facts asserted by Defendants as true. N.D.N.Y. L.R. 7.1(a)(3). Under the circumstances, I decline, and I recommend the Court decline, to perform an independent review of the record to find proof disputing this established fact for the several reasons described above in Part IV.A.1. of this Report-Recommendation.

Third, Plaintiff has failed to adduce evidence establishing that the policy in question is even unconstitutional. I note that, in his Supplemental Memorandum of Law, Plaintiff argues that "deliberate indifference to serious medical needs is ... shown by the fact that prisoners are denied access to a doctor and physical examination upon arrival at [Great Meadow] C.F. to determine the need for pain medications which aren't life sustaining" (Dkt. No. 88, at 10 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law].) As a threshold matter, Plaintiff's argument is misplaced to the extent he is arguing about the medical care other prisoners may not have received upon their arrival at Great Meadow C.F. since this is not a class-action. More importantly, to the extent he is arguing about any medical care that he (allegedly) did not receive upon his arrival at Great Meadow C.F., he cites no record evidence in support of such an assertion. (Id.) Indeed, he does not even cite any record evidence establishing that, upon his arrival at Great Meadow C.F. in early 2000, either (1) he asked a Defendant in this action for such medical care, or (2) he was suffering from a serious medical need for purposes of the Eighth Amendment. (Id.)

*9 If Plaintiff is complaining that Defendant Paolano is liable for recklessly causing a physician at Great Meadow C.F. to excessively delay a review Plaintiff's pain medication upon his arrival at Great Meadow C.F., then Plaintiff should have asserted that allegation (and some basic facts supporting it) in a pleading in this action so that Defendants could have taken adequate discovery on it, and so that the Court could squarely review the merits of it. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 11, at 53 [Plf.'s Depo.].)

For all of these reasons, I recommend that Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Paolano be dismissed with

prejudice.

B. Whether Plaintiff Has Adduced Evidence Establishing that Defendant Nesmith Was Deliberately Indifferent to Plaintiff's Serious Medical Needs

Generally, to state a claim for inadequate medical care, a plaintiff must allege facts plausibly suggesting two things: (1) that he had a sufficiently serious medical need; and (2) that the defendants were deliberately indifferent to that serious medical need. <u>Estelle v. Gamble</u>, 429 U.S. 97, 104, 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976); <u>Chance v. Armstrong</u>, 143 F.3d 698, 702 (2d Cir.1998).

Defendants argue that, even assuming that Plaintiff's broken wrist constituted a sufficiently serious medical condition for purposes of the Eighth Amendment, Plaintiff has not adduced evidence establishing that, on August 17, 2000, Defendant Nesmith acted with deliberate indifference to that medical condition. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 13, at 4-9 [Defs.' Memo. of Law].) In support of this argument, Defendants point to the record evidence establishing that Defendant Nesmith sutured lacerations in Plaintiff's forehead, ordered an x-ray examination of Plaintiff's wrist, and placed that wrist in a splint (with an intention to replace that splint with a cast once the swelling in Plaintiff's wrist subsided) within 24 hours of the onset of Plaintiff's injuries. (Id. at 7-9 [providing accurate record citations].) Moreover, argue Defendants, Plaintiff's medical records indicate that he did not first complain of an injury to his wrist until hours after he experienced that injury. (Id. at 8 [providing accurate record citation].)

Plaintiff responds that "[he] informed P.A. Nesmith that his wrist felt broken and P.A. Nesmith ignored plaintiff, which isn't reasonable. P.A. Nesmith didn't even care to do a physical examination to begin with[,] which would've revealed [the broken wrist] and is fundamental medical care after physical trauma." (Dkt. No. 88, at 11 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law].) In support of this argument, Plaintiff cites *no* record evidence. (*Id.* at 11-12.)

The main problem with Plaintiff's argument is that the uncontrovered record evidence establishes that, as Defendants have argued, Defendant Nesmith (1) sutured lacerations in Plaintiff's forehead within hours if not minutes of Plaintiff's injury and (2) ordered an x-ray

examination of Plaintiff's wrist, and placed that wrist in a splint (with an intention to replace that splint with a cast once the swelling in Plaintiff's wrist subsided) within 24 hours of the onset of Plaintiff's injuries. These facts were asserted by Defendants in Paragraphs 27 through 32 of their Rule 7.1 Statement. (See Dkt. No. 78, Part 12, ¶¶ 27-32 [Defs.' Rule 7.1 Statement].) Defendants supported these factual assertions with record evidence. (Id. [providing accurate record citations].) Plaintiff expressly admits most of these factual assertions, and fails to support his denial of the remaining factual assertions with citations to record evidence that actually controverts the facts asserted. (Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 48-50 [Ex. N to Plf.'s Affid.].)

*10 The only denial he supports with a record citation is with regard to when, within the referenced 24-hour period, Defendant Nesmith ordered his wrist x-ray. This issue is not material, since I have assumed, for purposes of Defendants' motion, merely that Defendant Nesmith ordered Plaintiff's wrist x-ray within 24 hours of the onset of Plaintiff's injury. FN28 (Indeed, whether the wrist x-ray was ordered in the late evening of August 17, 2000, or the early morning of August 18, 2000, would appear to be immaterial for the additional reason that it would appear unlikely that any x-rays could be conducted in the middle of the night in Great Meadow C.F.)

FN28. Furthermore, I note that the record evidence he references (in support of his argument that the x-ray was on the morning of August 18, 2000, not the evening of August 17, 2000) is "Defendants exhibit 20," which he says "contains [an] 11/20/00 Great Meadow Correctional Facility Investigation Sheet by P. Bundrick, RN, NA, and Interdepartmental Communication from defendant Ted Nesmith P.A. that state [that the] X ray was ordered on 8/18/00 in the morning." (Id.) I cannot find, in the record, any "exhibit 20" having been submitted by Defendants, who designated their exhibits by letter, not number. (See generally Dkt. No. 78.) However, at Exhibit G of Defendant Nesmith's affidavit, there is the "Investigation Sheet" to which Plaintiff refers. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 3, at 28 [Ex. G to Nesmith

Affid.].) The problem is that document does not say what Plaintiff says. Rather, it says, "Later that evening [on August 17, 2000] ... [a]n x-ray was ordered for the following morning" (Id.) In short, the document says that the x-ray was not ordered on the morning of August 18, 2007, but for that morning. Granted, the second document to which Plaintiff refers, the "Interdepartmental Communication" from Defendant Nesmith, does say that "I saw him the next morning and ordered an xray" (Id. at 29.) I believe that this is a misstatement, given the overwhelming record evidence to the contrary.

Moreover, in confirming the accuracy of Defendants' record citations contained in their Rule 7.1 Statement, I discovered several facts further supporting a finding that Defendant Nesmith's medical care to Plaintiff was both prompt and responsive. In particular, the record evidence cited by Defendants reveals the following specific facts:

- (1) at approximately 10:17 a.m. on August 17, 2000, Plaintiff was first seen by someone in the medical unit at Great Meadow C.F. (Nurse Hillary Cooper);
- (2) at approximately 10:40 a.m. on August 17, 2000, Defendant Nesmith examined Plaintiff; during that examination, the main focus of Defendant Nesmith's attention was Plaintiff's complaint of the lack of feeling in his lower extremities; Defendant Nesmith responded to this complaint by confirming that Plaintiff could still move his lower extremities, causing Plaintiff to receive an x-ray examination of his spine (which films did not indicate any pathology), and admitting Plaintiff to the prison infirmary for observation;
- (3) at approximately 11:00 a.m. on August 17, 2000, Defendant Nesmith placed four sutures in each of two 1/4" lacerations on Plaintiff's left and right forehead;
- (4) by 11:20 a.m. Plaintiff was given, or at least prescribed, Tylenol by a medical care provider;
- (5) Plaintiff's medical records reflect no complaint by Plaintiff of any <u>injury to his wrist</u> at any point in time other than between 4:00 p.m. and midnight on August 17,

2000;

(6) at some point after 9:00 p.m. on August 17, 2000, and 9:00 a.m. on the morning of August 18, 2000, Defendant Nesmith ordered that Plaintiff's wrist be examined by x-ray, in response to Plaintiff's complaint of an injured wrist; that x-ray examination occurred at Great Meadow C.F. at some point between 9:00 a.m. on August 17, 2000, and 11:00 a.m. on August 18, 2000, when Defendant Nesmith personally performed a "wet read" of the x-rays before sending them to Albany Medical Center for a formal reading by a radiologist;

(7) at approximately 11:00 a.m. on August 18, 2000, Defendant Nesmith placed a splint on Plaintiff's wrist and forearm with the intent of replacing it with a cast in a couple of days; the reason that Defendant Nesmith did not use a cast at that time was that Plaintiff's wrist and forearm were swollen, and Defendant Nesmith believed, based on 30 years experience treating hundreds of fractures, that it was generally not good medical practice to put a cast on a fresh fracture, because the cast will not fit tightly once the swelling subsides;

*11 (8) on August 22, 2000, Defendant Nesmith replaced the splint with a cast;

(9) on August 23, 2000, Plaintiff was discharged from the infirmary at Great Meadow C.F.; and

(10) on August 30, 2000, Defendant Nesmith removed the sutures from Plaintiff's forehead. (*See generally* Dkt. No. 78, Part 2, ¶¶ 3-15 [Affid. of Nesmith]; Dkt. No. 78, Part 3, Exs. A-E [Exs. to Affid. of Nesmith].)

"[D]eliberate indifference describes a state of mind more blameworthy than negligence," FN29 one that is "equivalent to criminal recklessness." FN30 There is no evidence of such criminal recklessness on the part of Defendant Nesmith, based on the uncontroverted facts before the Court, which show a rather prompt and responsive level of medical care given by Defendant Nesmith to Plaintiff, during the hours and days following the onset of his injuries.

FN29. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 835,

114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994) ("[D]eliberate indifference [for purposes of an Eighth Amendment claim] describes a state of mind more blameworthy than negligence."); Estelle, 429 U.S. at 106 ("[A] complaint that a physician has been negligent in diagnosing or treating a medical condition does not state a valid claim of medical mistreatment under the Eighth Amendment. Medical malpractice does not become a constitutional violation merely because the victim is a prisoner."); Murphy v. Grabo, 94-CV-1684, 1998 WL 166840, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. Apr. 9, 1998) (Pooler, J.) ("Deliberate indifference, whether evidenced by [prison] medical staff or by [prison] officials who allegedly disregard the instructions of [prison] medical staff, requires more than negligence.... Disagreement with prescribed treatment does not rise to the level of a constitutional claim.... Additionally, negligence by physicians, even amounting to malpractice, does not become a constitutional violation merely because the plaintiff is an inmate.... Thus, claims of malpractice or disagreement with treatment are not actionable under section 1983.") [citations omitted].").

FN30. Hemmings v. Gorczyk, 134 F.3d 104, 108 (2d Cir.1998) ("The required state of mind [for a deliberate indifference claim under the Eighth Amendment], equivalent to criminal recklessness, is that the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety: the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists; and he must also draw the inference.") [internal quotation marks and citations omitted]; Hathaway v. Coughlin, 99 F.3d 550, 553 (2d Cir.1996) ("The subjective element requires a state of mind that is the equivalent of criminal recklessness") [citation omitted]; cf. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 827 ("[S]ubjective recklessness as used in the criminal law is a familiar and workable standard that is consistent with the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause as

interpreted in our cases, and we adopt it as the test for 'deliberate indifference' under the Eighth Amendment.").

In his argument that his treatment in question constituted deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, Plaintiff focuses on the approximate 24-hour period that appears to have elapsed between the onset of his injury and his receipt of an x-ray examination of his wrist. He argues that this 24-hour period of time constituted a delay that was unreasonable and reckless. In support of his argument, he cites two cases. See Brown v. Hughes, 894 F.2d 1533, 1538-39 (11th Cir.), cert. denied, 496 U.S. 928, 110 S.Ct. 2624, 110 L.Ed.2d 645 (1990); Loe v. Armistead, 582 F.2d 1291, 1296 (4th Cir.1978), cert. denied, 446 U.S. 928, 100 S.Ct. 1865, 64 L.Ed.2d 281 (1980). However, the facts of both cases are clearly distinguishable from the facts of the case at hand.

In *Brown v. Hughes*, the Eleventh Circuit found a genuine issue of material fact was created as to whether a correctional officer knew of a prisoner's foot injury during the four hours in which no medical care was provided to the prisoner, so as to preclude summary judgment for that officer. *Brown*, 894 F.2d at 1538-39. However, the Eleventh Circuit expressly stated that the question of fact was created because the prisoner had "submitted affidavits stating that [the officer] was called to his cell because there had been a fight, that while [the officer] was present [the prisoner] began to limp and then hop on one leg, that his foot began to swell severely, that he told [the officer] his foot felt as though it were broken, and that [the officer] promised to send someone to look at it but never did." *Id*. Those are *not* the facts of this case.

In Loe v. Armistead, the Fourth Circuit found merely that, in light of the extraordinary leniency with which pro se complaints are construed, the court was unable to conclude that a prisoner had failed to state a claim upon which relief might be granted for purposes of a motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b) (6) because the prisoner had alleged that the defendants-despite being (at some point) "notified" of the prisoner's injured arm-had inexplicably delayed for 22 hours in giving him medical treatment for the injury. Loe, 582 F.2d at 1296. More specifically, the court expressly construed the prisoner's

complaint as alleging that, following the onset of the plaintiff's injury at 10:00 a.m. on the day in question, the plaintiff was immediately taken to the prison's infirmary where a nurse, while examining the prisoner's arm, heard him complain to her about pain. <u>Id. at 1292.</u> Furthermore, the court construed the prisoner's complaint as alleging that, "[t]hroughout the day, until approximately 6:00 p.m., [the prisoner] repeatedly requested that he be taken to the hospital. He was repeatedly told that only the marshals could take him to a hospital and that they had been notified of his injury." <u>Id.</u> at 1292-93. Again, those are not the facts of this case.

*12 Specifically, there is no evidence in the record of which I am aware that at any time before 4:00 p.m. on August 17, 2000, Defendant Nesmith either (1) heard Plaintiff utter a complaint about a wrist injury sufficient to warrant an x-ray examination or (2) observed physical symptoms in Plaintiff's wrist (such as an obvious deformity) that would place him on notice of such an injury. As previously stated, I decline, and I urge the Court to decline, to tediously sift through the 262 pages of documents that Plaintiff has submitted in the hope of finding a shred of evidence sufficient to create a triable issue of fact as to whether Plaintiff made, and Defendant Nesmith heard, such a complaint before 4:00 p.m. on August 17, 2000.

I note that, in reviewing Plaintiff's legal arguments, I have read his testimony on this issue. That testimony is contained at Paragraphs 8 through 12, and Paragraph 18, of his Supplemental Affidavit. (See Dkt. No. 86, at ¶¶ 8-10, 18 [Plf.'s Supp. Affid., containing two sets of Paragraphs numbed "5" through "11"].) In those Paragraphs, Plaintiff swears, in pertinent part, that "[w]hile I was on the x-ray table I told defendant Ted Nesmith, P.A. and/or Bill Redmond RN ... that my wrist felt broken, and was ignored." (Id. at ¶ 9.) Plaintiff also swears that "I was [then] put into a room in the facility clinic[,] and I asked defendant Ted Nesmith, PA[,] shortly thereafter for [an] x-ray of [my] wrist[,] pain medication and [an] ice pack but wasn't given it [sic]." (Id. at ¶ 10.) Finally, Plaintiff swears as follows: "At one point on 8/17/00 defendant Nesmith told me that he didn't give a damn when I kept complaining that my wrist felt broken and how I'm going to sue him cause I'm not stupid

[enough] to not know he's supposed to do [a] physical examination [of me], [and not] to ignore my complaints about [my] wrist feeling broke and feeling extreem [sic] pain. He told me [to] stop complaining [and that] he's done with me for the day." (*Id.* at ¶ 18.)

This last factual assertion is important since a response of "message received" from the defendant appears to have been critical in the two cases cited by Plaintiff. It should be emphasized that, according to the undisputed facts, when Plaintiff made his asserted wrist complaint to Defendant Nesmith during the morning of August 17, 2000, Defendant Nesmith was either suturing up Plaintiff's forehead or focusing on Plaintiff's complaint of a lack of feeling in his lower extremities. (This complaint of lack of feeling, by the way, was found to be inconsistent with Defendant Nesmith's physical examination of Plaintiff.)

In any event, Defendant Nesmith can hardly be said to have, in fact, "ignored" Plaintiff since he placed him under *observation* in the prison's infirmary (and apparently was responsible for the prescription of <u>Tylenol</u> for Plaintiff). FN31 Indeed, it was in the infirmary that Plaintiff was observed by a medical staff member to be complaining about his wrist, which resulted in an x-ray examination of Plaintiff's wrist.

FN31. In support of my conclusion that this fact alone is a sufficient reason to dismiss Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Nesmith, I rely on a case cited by Plaintiff himself. See Brown, 894 F.2d at 1539 ("Although no nurses were present [in the hospital] at the jail that day, the procedure of sending [the plaintiff] to the hospital, once employed, was sufficient to ensure that [the plaintiff's broken] foot was treated promptly. Thus, [the plaintiff] has failed to raise an issue of deliberate indifference on the part of these defendants, and the order of summary judgment in their favor must be affirmed.").

*13 Even if it were true that Plaintiff made a wrist complaint directly to Defendant Nesmith (during Defendant Nesmith's examination and treatment of Plaintiff between 10:40 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. on August 17,

2000), and Defendant Nesmith heard that complaint, and that complaint were specific and credible enough to warrant an immediate x-ray examination, there would be, at most, only some *negligence* by Defendant Nesmith in not ordering an x-ray examination until 9:00 p.m. that night.

As the Supreme Court has observed, "[T]he question of whether an X-ray-or additional diagnostic techniques or forms of treatment-is indicated is a classic example of a matter for medical judgment. A medical decision not to order an X-ray, or like measures, does not represent cruel and unusual punishment. At most it is medical malpractice...." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 107. For this reason, this Court has actually held that a 17-day delay between the onset of the prisoner's apparent wrist fracture and the provision of an x-ray examination and cast did not constitute deliberate indifference, as a matter of law. Miles v. County of Broome, 04-CV-1147, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15482, at *27-28, 2006 WL 561247 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 6, 2006) (McAvoy, J.) (granting defendants' motion for summary judgment with regard to prisoner's deliberate indifference claim).

> FN32. See also Sonds v. St. Barnabas Hosp. Corr. Health Servs., 151 F.Supp.2d 303, 312 (S.D.N.Y.2001) (prisoner's "disagreements over medications, diagnostic techniques (e.g., the need for X-rays), forms of treatment, or the need for specialists or the timing of their intervention [with regard to the treatment of his broken finger], are not adequate grounds for a section 1983 claim. These issues implicate medical judgments and, at worst, negligence amounting to medical malpractice, but not the Eighth Amendment.") [citation omitted]; cf. O'Bryan v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, 07-CV-0076, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65287, at *24-28 (E.D.Ky. Sept. 4, 2007) (holding no deliberate indifference where prisoner wore wrist brace/bandage on his broken wrist for two months even though he had asked for a cast; finding that "the type of wrap would only go the difference of opinion between a patient and doctor about what should be done, and the Supreme Court has stated that a difference of opinion regarding the plaintiff's

diagnosis and treatment does not state a constitutional claim.").

As I read Plaintiff's complaints about the medical care provided to him by Defendant Nesmith in this action, I am reminded of what the Second Circuit once observed:

It must be remembered that the State is not constitutionally obligated, much as it may be desired by inmates, to construct a perfect plan for [medical] care that exceeds what the average reasonable person would expect or avail herself of in life outside the prison walls. [A] correctional facility is not a health spa, but a prison in which convicted felons are incarcerated. Common experience indicates that the great majority of prisoners would not in freedom or on parole enjoy the excellence in [medical] care which plaintiff[] understandably seeks We are governed by the principle that the objective is not to impose upon a state prison a model system of [medical] care beyond average needs but to provide the minimum level of [medical] care required by the Constitution.... The Constitution does not command that inmates be given the kind of medical attention that judges would wish to have for themselves

<u>Dean v. Coughlin</u>, 804 F.2d 207, 215 (2d Cir.1986) [internal quotations and citations omitted].

For all of these reasons, I recommend that Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Nesmith be dismissed with prejudice.

C. Whether Defendant Nesmith Is Protected from Liability by the Doctrine of Qualified Immunity, As a Matter of Law

"Once qualified immunity is pleaded, plaintiff's complaint will be dismissed unless defendant's alleged conduct, when committed, violated 'clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.' "FN33 In determining whether a particular right was *clearly established*, courts in this Circuit consider three factors:

<u>FN33.</u> <u>Williams</u>, 781 F.2d at 322 (quoting <u>Harlow v. Fitzgerald</u>, 457 U.S. 800, 815 [1982]).

*14 (1) whether the right in question was defined with 'reasonable specificity'; (2) whether the decisional law of the Supreme Court and the applicable circuit court support the existence of the right in question; and (3) whether under preexisting law a reasonable defendant official would have understood that his or her acts were unlawful. FN34

FN34. Jermosen v. Smith, 945 F.2d 547, 550 (2d Cir.1991) (citations omitted).

Regarding the issue of whether a reasonable person would have known he was violating a clearly established right, this "objective reasonableness" FN35 test is met if "officers of reasonable competence could disagree on [the legality of defendant's actions]." FN36 As the Supreme Court explained,

FN35. See Anderson v. Creighton, 483 U.S. 635, 107 S.Ct. 3034, 3038, 97 L.Ed.2d 523 (1987) ("[W]hether an official protected by qualified immunity may be held personally liable for an allegedly unlawful official action generally turns on the 'objective reasonableness of the action.'") (quoting Harlow, 457 U.S. at 819); Benitez v. Wolff. 985 F.2d 662, 666 (2d Cir.1993) (qualified immunity protects defendants "even where the rights were clearly established, if it was objectively reasonable for defendants to believe that their acts did not violate those rights").

FN36. Malley v. Briggs, 475 U.S. 335, 341, 106 S.Ct. 1092, 89 L.Ed.2d 271 (1986); see also Malsh v. Correctional Officer Austin, 901 F.Supp. 757, 764 (S.D.N.Y.1995) (citing cases); Ramirez v. Holmes, 921 F.Supp. 204, 211 (S.D.N.Y.1996).

[T]he qualified immunity defense ... provides ample protection to all but the plainly incompetent or those who knowingly violate the law Defendants will not be immune if, on an objective basis, it is obvious that no reasonably competent officer would have concluded that a warrant should issue; but if officers of reasonable competence could disagree on this issue, immunity

should be recognized. FN37

FN37. Malley, 475 U.S. at 341.

Furthermore, courts in the Second Circuit recognize that "the use of an 'objective reasonableness' standard permits qualified immunity claims to be decided as a matter of law." FN38

FN38. Malsh, 901 F.Supp. at 764 (citing Cartier v. Lussier, 955 F.2d 841, 844 [2d Cir.1992] [citing Supreme Court cases].)

Here, I agree with Defendants that, based on the current record, it was not clearly established that, between August 17, 2000, and August 22, 2000, Plaintiff possessed an Eighth Amendment right to receive an x-ray examination and casting of his wrist any sooner than he did. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 13, at 9-11 [Defs.' Memo. of Law].) I note that neither of the two decisions cited by Plaintiff (discussed earlier in this Report-Recommendation) were controlling in the Second Circuit. See Brown v. Hughes, 894 F.2d 1533, 1538-39 (11th Cir.), cert. denied, 496 U.S. 928, 110 S.Ct. 2624, 110 L.Ed.2d 645 (1990); Loe v. Armistead, 582 F.2d 1291, 1296 (4th Cir.1978), cert. denied, 446 U.S. 928, 100 S.Ct. 1865, 64 L.Ed.2d 281 (1980). I also note that what was controlling was the Supreme Court's decision in Estelle v. Gamble, holding that "the question of whether an X-ray-or additional diagnostic techniques or forms of treatment-is indicated is a classic example of a matter for medical judgment. A medical decision not to order an X-ray, or like measures, does not represent cruel and unusual punishment. At most it is medical malpractice...." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 107.

Furthermore, I agree with Defendants that, at the very least, officers of reasonable competence could have believed that Defendant Nesmith's actions in conducting the x-ray examination and casting when he did were legal. FN39 In his memorandum of law, Plaintiff argues that Defendant Nesmith *intentionally* delayed giving Plaintiff an x-ray for 12 hours, and that the four-day delay of placing a hard cast on Plaintiff's wrist caused Plaintiff permanent injury to his wrist. (Dkt. No. 88, at 12-13 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law].) He cites no portion of the

record for either assertion. (*Id.*) Nor would the fact of permanent injury even be enough to propel Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim to a jury. FN40 I emphasize that it is an undisputed fact, for purposes of Defendants' motion, that the reason that Defendant Nesmith placed a splint and not a cast on Plaintiff's wrist and arm on the morning of August 18, 2000, was that Plaintiff's wrist and forearm were swollen, and Defendant Nesmith's medical judgment (based on his experience) was that it was not good medical practice to put a cast on a fresh fracture, because the cast will not fit tightly once the swelling subsides. FN41 Officers of reasonable competence could have believed that decision was legal.

FN39. (Id.)

FN40. This particular point of law was recognized in one of the cases Plaintiff himself cites. *Loe*, 582 F.2d at 1296, n. 3 ("[Plaintiff's] assertion that he suffered pain two and one-half weeks after the injury and that the fracture had not healed do not establish deliberate indifference or lack of due process. Similarly, his allegation that he has not achieved a satisfactory recovery suggests nothing more than possible medical malpractice. It does not assert a constitutional tort.").

FN41. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 12, ¶¶ 31-33 [Defs.' Rule 7.1 Statement]; see also Dkt. No. 78, Part 2, ¶¶ 11-13 [Affid. of Nesmith]; Dkt. No. 78, Part 3, Ex. C [Exs. to Affid. of Nesmith])

*15 As a result, I recommend that, in the alternative, the Court dismiss Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Nesmith based on the doctrine of qualified immunity.

D. Whether Plaintiff Has Adduced Evidence Establishing that He Exhausted His Available Administrative Remedies with Respect to His Assault Claim

The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA") requires that prisoners who bring suit in federal court must first exhaust their available administrative remedies: "No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under § 1983 ... by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison,

or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." FN42 "[T]he PLRA's exhaustion requirement applies to all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege excessive force or some other wrong." FN43 The Department of Correctional Services ("DOCS") has available a well-established three-step inmate grievance program. FN44

FN42. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e.

<u>FN43.</u> <u>Porter v. Nussle,</u> 534 U.S. 516, 532, 122 S.Ct. 983, 152 L.Ed.2d 12 (2002).

FN44. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.7.

Generally, the DOCS Inmate Grievance Program ("IGP") involves the following procedure. FN45 First, an inmate must file a complaint with the facility's IGP clerk within fourteen (14) calendar days of the alleged occurrence. A representative of the facility's inmate grievance resolution committee ("IGRC") has seven working days from receipt of the grievance to informally resolve the issue. If there is no such informal resolution, then the full IGRC conducts a hearing within seven (7) working days of receipt of the grievance, and issues a written decision within two (2) working days of the conclusion of the hearing. Second, a grievant may appeal the IGRC decision to the facility's superintendent within four (4) working days of receipt of the IGRC's written decision. The superintendent is to issue a written decision within ten (10) working days of receipt of the grievant's appeal. Third, a grievant may appeal to the central office review committee ("CORC") within four (4) working days of receipt of the superintendent's written decision. CORC is to render a written decision within twenty (20) working days of receipt of the appeal. It is important to emphasize that any failure by the IGRC or the superintendent to timely respond to a grievance or first-level appeal, respectively, can be appealed to the next level, including CORC, to complete the grievance process. FN46

FN45. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.7; see also White v. The State of New York, 00-CV-3434, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18791, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Oct 3, 2002).

FN46. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.6(g) ("[M]atters not decided within the time limits may be appealed to the next step."); Hemphill v. New York, 198 F.Supp.2d 546, 549 (S.D.N.Y.2002), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 380 F.3d 680 (2d Cir.2004); see, e.g., Croswell v. McCoy, 01-CV-0547, 2003 WL 962534, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. March 11, 2003) (Sharpe, M.J.) ("If a plaintiff receives no response to a grievance and then fails to appeal it to the next level, he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies as required by the PLRA."); Reves v. Punzal, 206 F. Supp.2d 431, 433 (W.D.N.Y.2002) ("Even assuming that plaintiff never received a response to his grievance, he had further administrative avenues of relief open to him."); Nimmons v. Silver, 03-CV-0671, Report-Recommendation, at 15-16 (N.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 29, 2006) (Lowe, M.J.) (recommending that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment, in part because plaintiff adduced no evidence that he appealed the lack of a timely decision by the facility's IGRC to the next level, namely to either the facility's superintendent or CORC), adopted by Decision and Order (N.D.N.Y. filed Oct. 17, 2006) (Hurd, J.).

Generally, if a prisoner has failed to follow each of these steps prior to commencing litigation, he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. FN47 However, the Second Circuit has held that a three-part inquiry is appropriate where a defendant contends that a prisoner has failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies, as required by the PLRA. FINAL First, "the court must ask whether [the] administrative remedies [not pursued by the prisoner] were in fact 'available' to the prisoner." FN49 Second, if those remedies were available, "the court should ... inquire as to whether [some or all of] the defendants may have forfeited the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it ... or whether the defendants' own actions inhibiting the [prisoner's] exhaustion of remedies may estop one or more of the defendants from raising the plaintiff's failure to exhaust as a defense." FN50 Third, if the remedies were available and some of the defendants did not forfeit, and

were not estopped from raising, the non-exhaustion defense, "the Court should consider whether 'special circumstances' have been plausibly alleged that justify the prisoner's failure to comply with the administrative procedural requirements." FNS1

FN47. Rodriguez v. Hahn, 209 F.Supp.2d 344, 347-48 (S.D.N.Y.2002); Reyes v. Punzal, 206 F.Supp.2d 431, 433 (W.D.N.Y.2002).

FN48. See Hemphill v. State of New York, 380 F.3d 680, 686, 691 (2d Cir.2004).

FN49. <u>Hemphill</u>, 380 F.3d at 686 (citation omitted).

FN50. Id. [citations omitted].

<u>FN51.</u> *Id.* [citations and internal quotations omitted].

*16 Defendants argue that Plaintiff never exhausted his available administrative remedies with regard to his claim arising out of the assault that allegedly occurred on August 17, 2000. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 13, at 9-11 [Defs.' Memo. of Law].)

Plaintiff responds with four different legal arguments. First, he appears to argue that he handed a written grievance to an unidentified corrections officer but never got a response from the IGRC, and that filing an appeal under such a circumstance is merely optional, under the PLRA (Dkt. No. 86, at 23-25, 44 [Plf.'s Memo. of Law].) Second, he argues that Defendants "can't realistically show" that Plaintiff never sent any grievances or appeals to the Great Meadow C.F. Inmate Grievance Clerk since that facility did not (during the time in question) have a grievance "receipt system." (Id. at 25-29.) In support of this argument, he cites unspecified record evidence that, although he sent a letter to one "Sally Reams" at some point and received a letter back from her on May 5, 2003, she later claimed that she had never received a letter from Plaintiff. (Id. at 29.) Third, he argues that the determination he received from CORC (at some point) satisfied the PLRA's exhaustion requirement. (Id. at 30-38.) Fourth, he argues that Defendants rendered any

administrative remedies "unavailable" to Plaintiff, for purposes of the Second Circuit's above-described three-part exhaustion inquiry, by (1) failing to cause DOCS to provide proper "instructional provisions" in its directives, (2) failing to cause Great Meadow C.F. to have a grievance "receipt system," and (3) "trash [ing]" Plaintiff's grievances and appeals. (*Id.* at 39-45.) FNS2

FN52. I note that the breadth of Plaintiff's creative, thoughtful and well-developed legal arguments further demonstrates his extraordinary experience as a litigant.

For the reasons set forth below, I reject each of these arguments. However, I am unable to conclude, for another reason, that Plaintiff has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies as a matter of law, based on the current record.

1. Plaintiff's Apparent Argument that an Appeal from His Lost or Ignored Grievance Was "Optional" Under the PLRA

Plaintiff apparently argues that filing an appeal to CORC when one has not received a response to one's grievance is merely optional under the PLRA. (Dkt. No. 86, at 23-25, 44 [Plf.'s Memo. of Law].) If this is Plaintiff's argument, it misses the point.

It may be true that the decision of whether or not to file an appeal in an action is always "optional"-from a metaphysical standpoint. However, it is also true that, in order to satisfy the PLRA's exhaustion requirement, one *must* file an appeal when one has not received a response to one's grievance (unless one of the exceptions contained in the Second Circuit's three-party inquiry exists). *See, supra,* note 46 of this Report-Recommendation.

2. Plaintiff's Argument that Defendants "Can't Realistically Show" that Plaintiff Never Sent any Grievances or Appeals to the Great Meadow C.F. Inmate Grievance Clerk

Plaintiff also argues that Defendants "can't realistically show" that Plaintiff never sent any grievances or appeals to the Great Meadow C.F. Inmate Grievance Clerk since that facility did not (during the time in question) have a grievance "receipt system." (Dkt. No. 86,

at 25-29 [Plf.'s Memo. of Law].) This argument also fails.

*17 Plaintiff appears to misunderstand the parties' respective burdens on Defendants' motion for summary judgment. Even though a failure to exhaust is an affirmative defense that a defendant must plead and prove, once a defendant has met his initial burden of establishing the absence of any genuine issue of material fact regarding exhaustion (which initial burden has been appropriately characterized as "modest"), FN53 the burden then shifts to the nonmoving party to come forward with specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial regarding exhaustion. See, supra, Part III of this Report-Recommendation.

FN53. See Ciaprazi v. Goord, 02-CV-0915, 2005 WL 3531464, at *8 (N.D.N.Y. Dec.22, 2005) (Sharpe, J.; Peebles, M.J.) (characterizing defendants' threshold burden on a motion for summary judgment as "modest") [citing Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323-324, 106 S.Ct. 2548, 91 L.Ed.2d 265 (1986)]; accord, Saunders v. Ricks, 03-CV-0598, 2006 WL 3051792, at *9 & n. 60 (N.D.N.Y. Oct.18, 2006) (Hurd, J., adopting Report-Recommendation of Lowe, M.J.), Smith v. Woods, 03-CV-0480, 2006 WL 1133247, at *17 & n. 109 (N.D.N.Y. Apr.24, 2006) (Hurd, J., adopting Report-Recommendation of Lowe, M.J.).

Here, it is an uncontrovered fact, for purposes of Defendants' motion, that (1) grievance records at Great Meadow C.F. indicate that Plaintiff never filed a timely grievance alleging that he had been assaulted by corrections officers at Great Meadow C.F. in 2000, and (2) records maintained by CORC indicate that Plaintiff never filed an appeal (to CORC) regarding any grievance alleging that he had been so assaulted. (See Dkt. No. 78, Part 12, ¶¶ 39-40 [Defs.' Rule 7.1 Statement, providing accurate record citations].) Plaintiff has failed to properly controvert these factual assertions with specific citations to record evidence that actually creates a genuine issue of fact. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 50-51 [Ex. N to Plf.'s Affid.].) As a result, under the Local Rules of Practice for this Court, Plaintiff has effectively "admitted" Defendants' referenced factual assertions. N.D.N.Y. L.R. 7.1(a)(3).

With respect to Plaintiff's argument that the referenced factual assertions are basically meaningless because Great Meadow C.F. did not (during the time in question) have a grievance "receipt system," that argument also fails. In support of this argument, Plaintiff cites unspecified record evidence that, although he sent a letter to Sally Reams (the IGP Supervisor at Great Meadow C.F. in May 2003) at some point and received a letter back from her on May 5, 2003, she later claimed that she had never received a letter from Plaintiff. (*Id.* at 29.) (*See* Dkt. No. 86, at 29 [Plf.'s Memo. of Law].) After examining Plaintiff's original Affidavit and exhibits, I located and carefully read the documents in question. (Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 23 [Plf.'s Affid.]; Dkt. No. 85, Part 2 [Exs. F and G to Plf.'s Affid.].)

These documents do not constitute sufficient evidence to create a triable question of fact on the issue of whether, in August and/or September of 2000, Great Meadow C.F. did not have a grievance "receipt system." At most, they indicate that (1) at some point, nearly three years after the events at issue, Plaintiff (while incarcerated at Attica C.F.) wrote to Ms. Reams complaining about the alleged assault on August 17, 2000, (2) she responded to Plaintiff, on May 5, 2003, that he must grieve the issue at Attica C.F., where he must request permission to file an untimely grievance, and (3) at some point between April 7, 2003, and June 23, 2003, Ms. Reams informed Mr. Eagen that she did not "remember" receiving "correspondence" from Plaintiff. (Id.) The fact that Ms. Reams, after the passing of several weeks and perhaps months, did not retain an independent memory (not record) of receiving a piece of "correspondence" (not grievance) from Plaintiff (who was not an inmate currently incarcerated at her facility) bears little if any relevance on the issue of whether Great Meadow C.F. had, in April and/or May of 2003, a mechanism by which it recorded its receipt of grievances. Moreover, whether or not Great Meadow C.F. had a grievance "receipt system" in April and/or May of 2003 bears little if any relevance to whether it had a grievance "receipt system" in August and/or September of 2000.

*18 It should be emphasized that Defendants have adduced record evidence specifically establishing that, in August and September 2000, Great Meadow C.F. had a functioning grievance-recording process through which,

when a prisoner (and specifically Plaintiff) filed a grievance, it was "assign[ed] a number, title and code" and "log[ged] ... into facility records." (Dkt. No. 78, Part 6, ¶¶ 7-9 [Bellamy Decl.]; Dkt. No. 78, Part 7, at 2 [Ex. A to Bellamy Decl.] Dkt. No. 78, Part 8, ¶ 4 [Brooks Decl.]; Dkt. No. 78, Part 9, at 6 [Ex. B to Brooks Decl.].)

Finally, even if Great Meadow C.F. did not (during the time in question) have a functioning grievance-recording process (thus, resulting in Plaintiff's alleged grievance never being responded to), Plaintiff still had the duty to appeal that non-response to the next level. See, supra, note 46 of this Report-Recommendation.

3. Plaintiff's Argument that the Determination He Received from CORC Satisfied the PLRA's Exhaustion Requirement

Plaintiff argues that the determination he received from CORC (at some point) satisfied the PLRA's exhaustion requirement. (Dkt. No. 86, at 30-38 [Plf.'s Memo. of Law].) This argument also fails.

Plaintiff does not clearly articulate the specific portion of the record where this determination is located. (See id. at 30 [Plf.'s Affid., referencing merely "plaintiff's affidavit and exhibits"].) Again, the Court has no duty to sua sponte scour the 209 pages that comprise Plaintiff's "affidavit and exhibits" for proof of a dispute of material fact, and I decline to do so (and recommend the Court decline to do so) for the reasons stated above in Part IV.A.1. of this Report-Recommendation. I have, however, in analyzing the various issues presented by Defendants' motion, reviewed what I believe to be the material portions of the documents to which Plaintiff refers. I report that Plaintiff appears to be referring to a determination by the Upstate C.F. Inmate Grievance Program, dated June 20, 2003, stating, "After reviewing [your June 11, 2003, Upstate C.F.] grievance with CORC, it has been determined that the grievance is unacceptable. It does not present appropriate mitigating circumstances for an untimely filing." (Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 37 [Ex. J to Plf.'s Affid.]; see also Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶¶ 22-34 [Plf.'s Affid.].)

There are two problems for Plaintiff with this document. First, this document does *not* constitute a written determination by *CORC* on a written appeal by

Plaintiff to *CORC* from an Upstate C.F. written determination. (*See* Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 37 [Ex. J to Plf.'s Affid.].) This fact is confirmed by one of Plaintiff's own exhibits, wherein DOCS IGP Director Thomas Eagen advises Plaintiff, "Contrary to the IGP Supervisor's assertion in his memorandum dated June 20, 2003, the IGP Supervisor's denial of an extension of the time frames to file your grievance from Great Meadow in August 2000 has not been reviewed by the Central Office Review Committee (CORC). The IGP Supervisor did review the matter with Central Office staff who is [sic] not a member of CORC." (*See* Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 39 [Ex. K to Plf.'s Affid.].) At best, the document in question is an indication by Upstate C.F. that the success of an appeal by Plaintiff to CORC would be unlikely.

*19 Second, even if the document does somehow constitute a written determination by CORC on appeal by Plaintiff, the grievance to which the determination refers is a grievance filed by Plaintiff on June 11, 2003, at Upstate C.F., not a grievance filed by Plaintiff on August 30, 2000, at Great Meadow C.F. (Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 32-35 [Ex. I to Plf.'s Affid.].) Specifically, Plaintiff's June 11, 2003, grievance, filed at Upstate C.F., requested permission to file an admittedly *untimely* grievance regarding the injuries he sustained during the assault on August 17, 2000. (*Id.*)

A prisoner has not exhausted his administrative remedies with CORC when, years after failing to file a timely appeal with CORC, the prisoner requests and is denied permission to file an untimely (especially, a two-year-old) appeal with CORC due to an unpersuasive showing of "mitigating circumstances." See Burns v. Zwillinger, 02-CV-5802, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1912, at *11 (S.D.N .Y. Feb. 8, 2005) ("Since [plaintiff] failed to present mitigating circumstances for his untimely appeal to the IGP Superintendent, the CORC, or this Court, [defendant's] motion to dismiss on the grounds that [plaintiff] failed to timely exhaust his administrative remedies is granted."); Soto v. Belcher, 339 F.Supp.2d 592, 595 (S.D.N.Y.2004) ("Without mitigating circumstances, courts consistently have found that CORC's dismissal of a grievance appeal as untimely constitutes failure to exhaust available administrative remedies.") [collecting cases]. If the rule were to the contrary, then, as

a practical matter, no prisoner could ever be said to have failed to exhaust his administrative remedies because, immediately before filing suit in federal court, he could perfunctorily write to CORC asking for permission to file an untimely appeal, and whatever the answer, he could claim to have completed the exhaustion requirement. The very reason for requiring that a prisoner obtain permission before filing an untimely appeal presumes that the permitted appeal would be required to complete the exhaustion requirement. Viewed from another standpoint, a decision by CORC to refuse the filing of an untimely appeal does not involve a review of the merits of the appeal.

4. Plaintiff's Argument that Defendants Rendered any Administrative Remedies "Unavailable" to Plaintiff

Plaintiff also argues that Defendants rendered any administrative remedies "unavailable" to Plaintiff, for purposes of the Second Circuit's above-described three-part exhaustion inquiry, by (1) failing to cause DOCS to provide proper "instructional provisions" in its directives, (2) failing to cause Great Meadow C.F. to have a grievance "receipt system," and (3) "trash [ing]" Plaintiff's grievances and appeals. (Dkt. No. 86, at 39-45 [Plf.'s Memo. of Law].) This argument also fails.

In support of this argument, Plaintiff "incorporates by reference all the previously asserted points, Plaintiff's Affidavit in Opposition with supporting exhibits, as well as[] the entire transcripts of Defendants['] deposition on [sic] Plaintiff" (Id. at 40, 45.) Again, the Court has no duty to sua sponte scour the 265 pages that comprise Plaintiff's Affidavit, Supplemental Affidavit, exhibits, and deposition transcript for proof of a dispute of material fact, and I decline to do so (and recommend the Court decline to do so) for the reasons stated above in Part IV.A.1. of this Report-Recommendation. I have, however, in analyzing the various issues presented by Defendants' motion, reviewed the documents to which Plaintiff refers, and I report that I have found no evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue of triable fact on the issue of whether Defendants, through their own actions, have inhibited Plaintiff exhaustion of remedies so as to estop one or more Defendants from raising Plaintiff's failure to exhaust as a defense.

*20 For example, Plaintiff has adduced no evidence

that he possesses any *personal knowledge* (only speculation) of any Defendant in this action having "trashed" his alleged grievance(s) and appeal(s), FNS4 nor has he even adduced evidence that it was *one of the named Defendants in this action* to whom he handed his alleged grievance(s) and appeal(s) for delivery to the Great Meadow C.F. Inmate Grievance Program Clerk on August 30, 2000, September 13, 2000, and September 27, 2000. FNS5 Similarly, the legal case cited by Plaintiff appears to have nothing to do with any Defendant to this action, nor does it even have to do with Great Meadow C.F. FNS6

FN54. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶¶ 13-14, 16-17 [Plf.'s Affid., asserting, "Prison officials trashed my grievances and appeals since they claim not to have them despite [the] fact I sent them in a timely manner. It's [the] only reason they wouldn't have them.... Prison officials have a history of trashing grievances and appeals... I've been subjected to having my grievances and appeals trashed prior to and since this matter and have spoken to alot [sic] of other prisoners whom [sic] said that they were also subjected to having their grievances and appeals trashed before and after this incident, in alot [sic] of facilities.... Suspecting foul play with respect to my grievances and appeals, I wrote, and spoke to[,] prison officials and staff that did nothing to rectify the matter, which isn't surprising considering [the] fact that it's an old problem"].)

FN55. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 6 [Plf.'s Affid., asserting only that "[o]n August 30th, 2000 plaintiff handed the correction officer collecting the mail in F Block SHU in the Great Meadow Correctional Facility an envelope addressed to the inmate grievance clerk ... which contained the grievances relative to this action at hand"]; Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 9 [Plf.'s Affid., asserting only that "[o]n September 13, 2000, I appealed said grievances to [the] Superintendent by putting them in [an] envelope addressed to [the] inmate grievance clerk and handing it to [the] correction officer collecting the mail, in F-Block

SHU [at] Great Meadow CF"]; Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 11 [Plf.'s Affid., asserting only that "[o]n September 27th, 2000, I appealed said grievance ... to C.O.R.C. by putting them [sic] in [an] envelope addressed to [the] inmate grievance clerk and handing it to [the] correction officer collecting the mail in F-Block SHU [at] Great Meadow CF"].)

FN56. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 15 [Plf.'s Affid., referencing case]; Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 16-17 [Ex. B to Plf.'s Affid., attaching a hand-written copy of case, which mentioned a prisoner's grievances that had been discarded in 1996 by an unidentified corrections officer at Sing Sing Correctional Facility].)

5. Record Evidence Creating Genuine Issue of Fact

Although I decline to *sua sponte* scour the lengthy record for proof of a triable issue of fact regarding exhaustion, I have, while deciding the many issues presented by Defendants' motion, had occasion to review in detail many portions of the record. In so doing, I have discovered evidence that I believe is sufficient to create a triable issue of fact on exhaustion.

Specifically, the record contains Plaintiff's testimony that (1) on August 30, 2000, he gave a corrections officer a grievance regarding the alleged assault on August 17, 2000, but he never received a response to that grievance, (2) on September 13, 2000, he gave a corrections officer an appeal (to the Superintendent) from that non-response, but again did not receive a response, and (3) on September 27, 2000, he gave a corrections officer an appeal (to CORC) from that non-response, but again did not receive a response. FNST

FN57. (See Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 6 [Plf.'s Affid., asserting only that "[o]n August 30th, 2000 plaintiff handed the correction officer collecting the mail in F Block SHU in the Great Meadow Correctional Facility an envelope addressed to the inmate grievance clerk in which contained [sic] the grievances relative to this action at hand"]; Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 9 [Plf.'s Affid., asserting only that "[o]n September 13, 2000, I appealed said grievances to [the] Superintendent

by putting them in [an] envelope addressed to [the] inmate grievance clerk and handing it to [the] correction officer collecting the mail; in F-Block SHU [at] Great Meadow CF...."]; Dkt. No. 85, Part 1, ¶ 11 [Plf.'s Affid ., asserting only that "[o]n September 27h, 2000, I appealed said grievance ... to C.O.R.C. by putting them [sic] in [an] envelope addressed to [the] inmate grievance clerk and handing it to [the] correction officer collecting the mail in F-Block SHU [at] Great Meadow CF"].)

The remaining issue then, as it appears to me, is whether or not this affidavit testimony is so self-serving and unsubstantiated by other direct evidence that "no reasonable juror would undertake the suspension of disbelief necessary to credit the allegations made in the complaint." FN58 Granted, this testimony appears self-serving. However, based on the present record, I am unable to find that the testimony is so wholly unsubstantiated by other direct evidence as to be incredible. Rather, this testimony appears corroborated by two pieces of evidence. First, the record contains what Plaintiff asserts is the grievance that he handed to a corrections officer on August 30, 2000, regarding the alleged assault on August 17, 2000. (Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 65-75 [Ex. Q to Plf.'s Affid.].) Second, the record contains two pieces of correspondence between Plaintiff and legal professionals during or immediately following the time period in question containing language suggesting that Plaintiff had received no response to his grievance. (Dkt. No. 85, Part 2, at 19-21 [Exs. C-D to Plf.'s Affid .].)

FN58. See, supra, note 12 of this Report-Recommendation (collecting cases).

Stated simply, I find that sufficient record evidence exists to create a genuine issue of fact as to (1) whether Plaintiff's administrative remedies were, with respect to his assault grievance during the time in question, "available" to him, for purposes of the first part of the Second Circuit's three-part exhaustion inquiry, and/or (2) whether Plaintiff has shown "special circumstances" justifying his failure to comply with the administrative procedural requirements, for purposes of the third part of the Second Circuit's three-part exhaustion inquiry.

*21 As a result, I recommend that the Court deny this portion of Defendants' motion for summary judgment.

E. Whether Plaintiff Has Sufficiently Alleged, or Established, that Defendants Were Liable for the Policy to Review the Non-Life-Sustaining Medical Prescriptions of Prisoners Upon Arrival at Great Meadow C.F.

As explained above in Part II.A. of this Report-Recommendation, Defendants argue that, during his deposition in this action, Plaintiff asserted, for the first time, a claim that the medical staff at Great Meadow C.F. violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment by failing to honor non-life-sustaining medical prescriptions written at a former facility. (Dkt. No. 78, Part 13, at 3 [Defs.' Mem. of Law].) As a threshold matter, Defendants argue, this claim should be dismissed since Plaintiff never included the claim in his Second Amended Complaint, nor did Plaintiff ever file a motion for leave to file a Third Amended Complaint. (Id.) In any event, Defendants argue, even if the Court were to reach the merits of this claim, the Court should dismiss the claim because Plaintiff has failed to allege facts plausibly suggesting, or adduce evidence establishing, that Defendants were personally involved in the creation or implementation of DOCS' prescription-review policy, nor has Plaintiff provided such allegations or evidence indicating the policy is even unconstitutional. (Id.)

Plaintiff responds that "[he] didn't have to get in particular [sic] about the policy [of] discontinuing all incoming prisoners['] non[-]life[-]sustaining medications without examination and indiscriminently [sic] upon arrival at [Great Meadow] C.F. in [his Second] Amended Complaint. Pleading[s] are just supposed to inform [a] party about [a] claim[,] and plaintiff informed defendant [of] the nature of [his] claims including [the claim of] inadequate medical care. And discovery revealed [the] detail[s] [of that claim] as [Plaintiff had] intended." (Dkt. No. 88, at 10 [Plf.'s Supp. Memo. of Law].) In addition, Plaintiff responds that Defendant Paolano must have been personally involved in the creation and/or implementation of the policy in question since he was the Great Meadow Health Services Director. (Id. at 10.)

I agree with Defendants that this claim is not properly

before this Court. Plaintiff's characterization of the notice-pleading standard, and of the contents of his Amended Complaint, are patently without support (both legally and factually). It has long been recognized that a "claim," under Fed.R.Civ.P. 8, denotes "the aggregate of operative facts which give rise to a right enforceable in the courts." FN59 Clearly, Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint alleges no facts whatsoever giving rise to an asserted right to be free from the application of the prescription-review policy at Great Meadow C.F. Indeed, his Second Amended Complaint-which asserts Eighth Amendment claims arising solely out of events that (allegedly) transpired on August 17, 2000-says nothing at all of the events that transpired immediately upon his arrival at Great Meadow C.F. in early August of 2000, nor does the Second Amended Complaint even casually mention the words "prescription," "medication" or "policy." (See generally Dkt. No. 10 [Second Am. Compl.].)

FN59. Original Ballet Russe, Ltd. v. Ballet Theatre, Inc., 133 F.2d 187, 189 (2d Cir.1943); United States v. Iroquois Apartments, Inc., 21 F.R.D. 151, 153 (E.D.N.Y.1957); Birnbaum v. Birrell, 9 F.R.D. 72, 74 (S.D.N.Y.1948).

*22 Furthermore, under the notice-pleading standard set forth by Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2), to which Plaintiff refers in his Supplemental Memorandum of Law, Defendants are entitled to fair notice of Plaintiff's claims. FN60 The obvious purpose of this rule is to protect defendants from undefined charges and to facilitate a proper decision on the merits. FN61 A complaint that fails to provide such fair notice "presents far too heavy a burden in terms of defendants' duty to shape a comprehensive defense and provides no meaningful basis for the Court to assess the sufficiency of [plaintiff's] claims." FN62 This fair notice does not occur where, as here, news of the claim first springs up in a deposition more than two years after the action was commenced, approximately seven months after the amended-pleading deadline expired, and approximately two weeks before discovery in the action was scheduled to close. (Compare Dkt. No. 1 [Plf.'s Compl., filed 8/14/03] with Dkt. No. 42, at 1-2 [Pretrial Scheduling Order setting amended-pleading deadline as 2/28/05] and Dkt. No. 78, Part 11, at 52-53 [Plf.'s Depo.

Transcript, dated 9/30/05] *and* Dkt. No. 49 [Order setting discovery deadline as 10/14/05].)

FN60. Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo, 544 U.S. 336, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 1634, 161 L.Ed.2d 577 (2005) (the statement required by Fed.R.Civ.P.8 [a][2] must "give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff's claim is and the grounds upon which it rests").

FN61. Ruffolo v. Oppenheimer & Co., Inc., 90-CV-4593, 1991 WL 17857, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Feb.5, 1991); Howard v. Koch, 575 F.Supp. 1299, 1304 (E.D.N.Y.1982); Walter Reade's Theatres, Inc. v. Loew's Inc., 20 F.R.D. 579, 582 (S.D.N.Y.1957).

FN62. Gonzales v. Wing. 167 F.R.D. 352, 355 (N.D.N.Y.1996) (McAvoy, J.), aff'd, 113 F.3d 1229 (2d Cir.1997) (unpublished table opinion). Consistent with the Second Circuit's application of § 0.23 of the Rules of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, I cite this unpublished table opinion, not as precedential authority, but merely to show the case's subsequent history. See, e.g., Photopaint Tech., LLC v. Smartlens Corp., 335 F.3d 152, 156 (2d Cir.2003) (citing, for similar purpose, unpublished table opinion of Gronager v. Gilmore Sec. & Co., 104 F.3d 355 [2d Cir.1996]).

Under the circumstances, the mechanism by which to assert such a late-blossoming claim was a motion to reopen the amended-pleading filing deadline (the success of which depended on a showing of cause), coupled with a motion for leave file a Third Amended Complaint (the success of which depended, in part, on a showing of lack of prejudice to Defendants, as well as a lack of futility). Plaintiff never made such motions, nor showed such cause.

I acknowledge that, generally, the liberal notice-pleading standard set forth by Fed.R.Civ.P. 8 is applied with even greater force where the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. In other words, while all pleadings are to be construed liberally, *pro se* civil rights pleadings are

generally construed with an *extra* degree of liberality. As an initial matter, I have already concluded, based on my review of Plaintiff's extensive litigation experience, that he need not be afforded such an extra degree of leniency since the rationale for such an extension is a *pro se* litigant's inexperience with the court system and legal terminology, and here Plaintiff has an abundance of such experience. *See, supra,* notes 21-25 of this Report-Recommendation. Moreover, even if he were afforded such an extra degree of leniency, his phantom prescription-review claim could not be read into his Second Amended Pleading, for the reasons discussed above. (I note that, even when a plaintiff is proceeding *pro se,* "all normal rules of pleading are not absolutely suspended.") FN63

FN63. Stinson v. Sheriff's Dep't of Sullivan Cty., 499 F.Supp. 259, 262 & n. 9 (S.D.N.Y.1980); accord, Standley v. Dennison, 05-CV-1033, 2007 WL 2406909, at *6, n. 27 (N.D.N.Y. Aug.21, 2007) (Sharpe, J., adopting report-recommendation of Lowe, M.J.); Muniz v. Goord, 04-CV-0479, 2007 WL 2027912, at *2 (N.D.Y.Y. July 11, 2007) (McAvoy, J., adopting report-recommendation of Lowe, M.J.); DiProjetto v. Morris Protective Serv., 489 F.Supp.2d 305, 307 (W.D.N.Y.2007); Cosby v. City of White Plains, 04-CV-5829, 2007 WL 853203, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Feb.9, 2007); Lopez v. Wright, 05-CV-1568, 2007 WL 388919, at *3, n. 11 (N.D.N.Y. Jan.31, 2007) (Mordue, C.J., adopting report-recommendation of Lowe, M.J.); Richards v. Goord, 04-CV-1433, 2007 WL 201109, at *5 (N.D.N.Y. Jan.23, 2007) (Kahn, J., adopting report-recommendation of Lowe, M.J.); Ariola v. Onondaga County Sheriff's Dept., 04-CV-1262, 2007 WL 119453, at *2, n. 13 (N.D.N.Y. Jan.10, 2007) (Hurd, J., adopting report-recommendation of Lowe, M.J.); Collins v. Fed. Bur. of Prisons, 05-CV-0904, 2007 WL 37404, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. Jan.4, 2007) (Kahn, J., adopting report-recommendation of Lowe, M.J.).

Nor could Plaintiff's late-blossoming prescription-review claim properly be read into his papers in opposition to Defendants' motion for summary

judgment. Granted, a pro se plaintiff's papers in opposition to a motion to dismiss may sometimes be read as effectively amending a pleading (e.g., if the allegations in those papers are consistent with those in the pleading). However, a pro se plaintiff's papers in opposition to a motion for summary judgment may not be so read, in large part due to prejudice that would inure to the defendants through having the pleading changed after discovery has occurred and they have gone through the expense of filing a motion for summary judgment. FN64

FN64. See Auguste v. Dept. of Corr., 424 F.Supp.2d363,368 (D.Conn.2006) ("Auguste [a pro se civil rights plaintiff] cannot amend his complaint in his memorandum in response to defendants' motion for summary judgment.") [citations omitted].

*23 Finally, in the event the Court decides to construe Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint as somehow asserting this claim, I agree with Defendants that the Court should dismiss that claim, also for the reasons discussed above in Part IV.A.2. of this Report-Recommendation. Specifically, Plaintiff has failed to adduce evidence establishing that Defendant Paolano (or any named Defendant in this action) was personally involved in the creation or implementation of DOCS' prescription-review policy, nor has Plaintiff provided evidence establishing that the policy is even unconstitutional. See, supra, Part IV.A.2. of this Report-Recommendation.

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that the Clerk's Office shall, in accordance with note 1 of this Order and Report-Recommendation, correct the docket sheet to remove the names of Defendants Englese, Edwards, Bump, Smith, Paolano, and Nesmith as "counter claimants" in this action; and it is further

RECOMMENDED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 78) be *GRANTED* in part (i.e., to the extent that it requests the dismissal with prejudice of Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Paolano and Nesmith) and *DENIED* in part (i.e., to the extent that it requests dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against the

remaining Defendants on the grounds of Plaintiff's failure to exhaust available administrative remedies) for the reasons stated above.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.1(c), the parties have ten days within which to file written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court. FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. Roldan v. Racette, 984 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir.1993) (citing Small v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs., 892 F.2d 15 [2d Cir.1989]); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(a), 6(e), 72.

N.D.N.Y.,2008.

Murray v. Palmer Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2008 WL 2522324 (N.D.N.Y.) END OF DOCUMENT



--- F.Supp.2d ----, 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.) (Cite as: 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.))

Н

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, N.D. New York. Julio Isley SMITH, Plaintiff,

v.

C.F. KELLY, Jr., Captain, Great Meadow Corr. Facility; and James Levine, Prison Guard, Great Meadow Corr. Facility, FN1 Defendants.

No. 9:06-CV-0505 (GTS/ATB). Oct. 30, 2013.

Background: Prisoner brought pro se § 1983 action against correctional officers and prison superintendent, asserting claims First Amendment retaliation in connection with prisoner's transfer to different prison after he submitted to New York State Inspector General a "racial assault charge" complaining that nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate. The District Court, Lawrence E. Kahn, J., dismissed against correctional officers. claims After reassignment of case, the District Court, Glenn T. Suddaby, J., 2011 WL 1097862, adopting the report and recommendation of Andrew T. Baxter, United States Magistrate Judge, 2011 WL 1097863, granted summary judgment to defendants. Prisoner appealed and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. After partial dismissal of appeal, 2011 WL 10944867, the Court of Appeals, 510 Fed. Appx. 17, vacated and remanded. On remand, defendants sought dismissal based on failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

Holdings: The District Court, Glenn T. Suddaby, J., held that:

- (1) evidence established that administrative remedies not pursued by prisoner were available to him;
- (2) defendants were not estopped from asserting non-exhaustion; and
- (3) prisoner's alleged receipt of misinformation was

not a special circumstance excusing exhaustion.

Complaint dismissed without prejudice.

West Headnotes

[1] Prisons 310 \$\infty\$ 317

310 Prisons

310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings

310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies 310k317 k. In General, Most Cited

Cases

The Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA) was enacted to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of prisoner suits by affording corrections officials time and opportunity to address complaints internally, through exhaustion of administrative remedies, before allowing the initiation of a federal case. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[2] Administrative Law and Procedure 15A 229

15A Administrative Law and Procedure

15AIII Judicial Remedies Prior to or Pending Administrative Proceedings

15Ak229 k. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies, Most Cited Cases

Exhaustion of administrative remedies before suit serves two major purposes: first, it protects administrative agency authority by giving the agency an opportunity to correct its own mistakes with respect to the programs it administers before it is haled into federal court, discouraging disregard of the agency's procedures, and second, it promotes efficiency because claims generally can be resolved much more quickly and economically in proceedings before an agency than in litigation in federal court, and because even where a controversy survives administrative review, exhaustion of the administrative procedure may produce a useful record for subsequent judicial

consideration.

[3] Prisons 310 \$\infty\$ 317

```
310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k317 k. In General. Most Cited
```

Cases

The Prison Litigation Reform Act's (PLRA) requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies applies to all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege excessive force or some other wrong. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[4] Prisons 310 \$\infty\$ 317

```
310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k317 k. In General. Most Cited
Cases
```

Under New York law as predicted by the district court, even if the grievance was never assigned a grievance number, a prisoner, in order to exhaust administrative remedies, must appeal to the prison superintendent, from an inmate grievance resolution committee's (IGRC) nonresponse to the prisoner's grievance. 7 NYCRR 701.6(g).

[5] Prisons 310 \$\infty\$ 317

```
310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k317 k. In General. Most Cited
Cases
```

Three-part inquiry is appropriate where a defendant in a prisoner's civil suit contends that prisoner has failed to exhaust his available

administrative remedies, as required by Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA): first, court must ask whether administrative remedies not pursued by prisoner were in fact available to prisoner, second, if those remedies were available, court should inquire as to whether some or all defendants may have forfeited affirmative defense of nonexhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it or whether defendants' own actions inhibiting prisoner's exhaustion of remedies may estop one or more of the defendants from raising prisoner's failure to exhaust as defense, and third, if remedies were available and some defendants did not forfeit and are not estopped from raising non-exhaustion defense, court should consider whether special circumstances have been plausibly alleged that justify prisoner's failure to comply administrative procedural requirements. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[6] Prisons 310 🖘 317

```
310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k317 k. In General. Most Cited
```

Cases

Under certain circumstances, an inmate may exhaust his administrative remedies for a civil claim, as required by Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), by raising his claim during a related disciplinary proceeding, which circumstances include instances in which: (1) the inmate reasonably believed that his only available remedy was to raise his claim as part of a tier disciplinary hearing, and (2) the inmate articulated and pursued his claim in the disciplinary proceeding in a manner that afforded prison officials the time and opportunity to thoroughly investigate that claim. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[7] Jury 230 \$\infty\$ 14(1.5)

230 Jury
230II Right to Trial by Jury
230k14 Particular Actions and Proceedings
230k14(1.5) k. Civil Rights Actions. Most
Cited Cases

In a lawsuit governed by the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), a prisoner is not entitled to a jury trial on disputed factual issues relating to his exhaustion of administrative remedies; rather, PLRA exhaustion is a matter of judicial administration. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[8] Prisons 310 \$\iiii 321

310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k321 k. Evidence. Most Cited

Cases

Given that non-exhaustion of administrative remedies, which exhaustion is required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), is an affirmative defense, the defendant bears the burden of showing that a prisoner has failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[9] Prisons 310 \$\infty\$ 321

310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k321 k. Evidence. Most Cited

Cases

Once a defendant in a prisoner's civil suit has adduced reliable evidence that administrative remedies were available to the prisoner and that the prisoner nevertheless failed to exhaust those administrative remedies, which exhaustion is required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), the prisoner must then counter the defendant's assertion by showing exhaustion, unavailability, estoppel, or special circumstances,

and as a result, practically speaking, while the burden on the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion remains at all times on defendant, the prisoner may sometimes have to adduce evidence in order to defeat it. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[10] Prisons 310 \$\infty\$ 317

310 Prisons
310II Prisoners and Inmates
310II(H) Proceedings
310k316 Exhaustion of Other Remedies
310k317 k. In General, Most Cited

Cases

There is no exhaustion of administrative remedies under New York law, for purposes of Prison Litigation Reform Act's (PLRA) requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies, where a New York inmate complains directly to New York State Inspector General instead of complaining to prison superintendent and having the complaint referred to Inspector General, the Inspector General renders a finding of unsubstantiation, and inmate fails to appeal that finding to central office review committee (CORC). Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e; 7 NYCRR 701.8(d).

[11] Civil Rights 78 🖘 1319

78 Civil Rights
78III Federal Remedies in General
78k1314 Adequacy, Ava

78k1314 Adequacy, Availability, and Exhaustion of State or Local Remedies

78k1319 k. Criminal Law Enforcement;

Prisons. Most Cited Cases

For purposes of Prison Litigation Reform Act's (PLRA) requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies, evidence established that administrative remedies not pursued by New York prisoner were available to him, before he filed § 1983 suit asserting First Amendment retaliation in connection with prisoner's transfer to different prison after he submitted to New York State Inspector General a "racial assault charge"

(Cite as: 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.))

complaining that nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate; directive Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS) mandated the existence of grievance program at transferee prison, correctional sergeant and inmate grievance supervisor testified that there was a working grievance program at transferee prison of which inmates were aware, including thorough orientation program, law library, and grievance clerks, prisoner's verified complaint answered "Yes" to question whether transferee prison had a grievance procedure, and prisoner's testimony acknowledged that there was a working grievance program at transferee prison and that he had filed more than 40 grievances. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e; 7 NYCRR 701.8(d).

[12] Civil Rights 78 🖘 1311

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General

78k1306 Availability, Adequacy,

Exclusivity, and Exhaustion of Other Remedies

78k1311 k. Criminal Law Enforcement; Prisons, Most Cited Cases

A defendant in a prisoner civil rights action may not be estopped from asserting the affirmative defense of failure to exhaust administrative remedies, which exhaustion is required by Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), based on the actions or inactions of other individuals. Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[13] Civil Rights 78 🖘 1319

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General

78k1314 Adequacy, Availability, and Exhaustion of State or Local Remedies

78k1319 k. Criminal Law Enforcement; Prisons. Most Cited Cases

Mere acknowledgment by defendant correctional officer at transferor prison, that he had

recommended prisoner's transfer to transferee prison, without any evidence that officer contacted one or more correctional officers at transferee prison and persuaded them to threaten and/or intimidate prisoner not to exhaust his administrative remedies, did not support an estoppel that would prevent assertion, by the defendant officer in question or other defendant officers, of prisoner's failure to satisfy Prison Litigation Reform Act's of exhaustion (PLRA) requirement administrative remedies, before prisoner filed § 1983 suit alleging that the transfer was retaliation, in violation of First Amendment, for prisoner's complaint to New York State Inspector General regarding non-party correctional officer's allegedly racially-motivated assault of another inmate at transferor prison. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[14] Civil Rights 78 🖘 1319

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General

78k1314 Adequacy, Availability, and Exhaustion of State or Local Remedies

78k1319 k. Criminal Law Enforcement; Prisons. Most Cited Cases

Prisoner did not show threats or intimidation, as purported special circumstance excusing his failure to exhaust his administrative remedies, which exhaustion was required under Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), before filing § 1983 suit alleging First Amendment retaliation in connection with prisoner's transfer to different prison after he submitted to New York State Inspector General a "racial assault charge" complaining that nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate; remarks of prison official at transferee prison were vague and general, and within six weeks of hearing them, prisoner purportedly filed an initial grievance. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

(Cite as: 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.))

[15] Civil Rights 78 © 1319

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General

78k1314 Adequacy, Availability, and Exhaustion of State or Local Remedies

78k1319 k. Criminal Law Enforcement; Prisons, Most Cited Cases

Prisoner's purported lack of awareness of procedures for filing a formal administrative complaint against a superintendent for transferor prison was not a special circumstance excusing his failure to exhaust his administrative remedies, which exhaustion was required under Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), before filing § 1983 suit alleging First Amendment retaliation by nonsuperintendent correctional officers at transferor prison, in connection with prisoner's transfer to different prison after he submitted to New York State Inspector General a "racial assault charge" complaining that nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1 ; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[16] Civil Rights 78 \$\infty\$ 1319

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General

78k1314 Adequacy, Availability, and Exhaustion of State or Local Remedies

78k1319 k. Criminal Law Enforcement; Prisons. Most Cited Cases

Assuming that prisoner had received misinformation, at transferee prison, that a new prisoner would not file a grievance at transferee prison if it pertained to prisoner's previous prison, such misinformation was not a special circumstance excusing prisoner's failure to exhaust his administrative remedies, which exhaustion was required under Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), before filing § 1983 suit alleging First Amendment retaliation by correctional officers at transferor prison, in connection with prison transfer after prisoner submitted to New York State Inspector General a "racial assault charge"

complaining that nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate; it was difficult to believe that prisoner, who was an experienced "prisoner litigator," would have disregarded plain language of directive from New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS) that an administrative complaint could be filed only at the facility where an inmate was housed even if it pertained to another facility, and prisoner did not allege that based on misinformation he tried to file a grievance at transferor prison. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

[17] Civil Rights 78 🖘 1319

78 Civil Rights

78III Federal Remedies in General

78k1314 Adequacy, Availability, and Exhaustion of State or Local Remedies

78k1319 k. Criminal Law Enforcement; Prisons. Most Cited Cases

Assuming that substantial compliance with Prison Litigation Reform Act's (PLRA) requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies could be sufficient, prisoner did not substantially comply with prison's administrative grievance procedures, before filing § 1983 suit alleging First Amendment retaliation by correctional officers in connection with prison transfer after prisoner submitted to New York State Inspector General a "racial assault charge" complaining that nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate, where prisoner filed grievance four-and-a-half years late and while litigation was pending, and he skipped an appeal to prison superintendent and instead appealed the rejection of his grievance, which was based on untimeliness, to central office review committee (CORC), which never passed on merits of his grievance. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, § 101, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1997e.

Martin A. Lynn, Esq., Lynn Law Firm, Syracuse, NY, Pro Bono Trial for Plaintiff.

James Seamon, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, Eric T. Schneiderman, Attorney General for the State of New York, Albany, NY, for Defendants.

DECISION and **ORDER**

GLENN T. SUDDABY, District Judge.

*1 Currently before the Court is a prisoner civil rights action filed by Julio Isley Smith ("Plaintiff") asserting a claim of retaliation against Great Meadow Correctional Facility Captain C.F. Kelly and Prison Guard James Levine ("Defendants") pursuant to the First Amendment and 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that, because Plaintiff sent a written "racial assault charge" to the Office of the New York State Inspector General on February 27, 2006 (complaining that a nonparty correctional officer assaulted another inmate earlier that day), Kelly placed him on a "72 hour investigation" on March 15, 2006, Kelly and Levine transferred him to Auburn Correctional Facility on March 16, 2006, and Levine told the guards at Auburn Correctional Facility that the transfer was punishment for complaining, which caused Plaintiff to be transferred to a restrictive unit within Auburn Correctional Facility ("Auburn C.F."). (Dkt. No. 10; Dkt. No. 114.) On September 19, 2013, the Court held an evidentiary hearing regarding Defendants' affirmative defense that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies before filing this action, as required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, before filing this action on 2006. FN2 April 17, At the and-a-half-hour-long documentary hearing, evidence was admitted, and testimony was taken of Plaintiff as well as of Defendants' three witness—Auburn C.F. Sergeant Michael Murray, Auburn C.F. Inmate Grievance Supervisor Sheryl Parmiter, and New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision Inmate Grievance Program Director Karen Bellamy-whom Plaintiff was able to crossexamine through pro bono trial counsel. At the conclusion of the hearing, the undersigned indicated that a written decision would follow. This

is that written decision. For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is dismissed because of his failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies.

I. RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARD

[1][2][3] The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 ("PLRA") requires that prisoners who bring suit in federal court must first exhaust their available administrative remedies: "No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under § 1983 ... by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, other correctional facility until administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." 42 U.S.C. § 1997e. The PLRA was enacted "to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of prisoner suits" by "afford[ing] corrections officials time and opportunity to address complaints internally before allowing the initiation of a federal case." Porter v. Nussle, 534 U.S. 516, 524-25, 122 S.Ct. 983, 152 L.Ed.2d 12 (2002). In this regard, exhaustion serves two major purposes. First, it protects "administrative agency authority" by giving the agency "an opportunity to correct its own mistakes with respect to the programs it administers before it is haled into federal court, and it discourages disregard of the agency's procedures." Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 89, 126 S.Ct. 2378, 165 L.Ed.2d 368 (2006). Second, exhaustion promotes efficiency because (a) "[c]laims generally can be resolved much more quickly and economically in proceedings before an agency than in litigation in federal court," and (b) "even where a controversy survives administrative review, exhaustion of the administrative procedure may produce a useful record for subsequent judicial consideration." Woodford, 548 U.S. at 89. "[T]he PLRA's exhaustion requirement applies to all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege excessive force or some other wrong." Porter, 534 U.S. at 532.

*2 In accordance with the PLRA, the New York State Department of Corrections and

Community Supervision ("DOCCS") has made available a well-established inmate grievance program. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.7. Generally, the DOCCS Inmate Grievance Program ("IGP") involves the following three-step procedure for the filing of grievances. 7 N.Y.C .R.R. §§ 701.5, 701.6(g), 701.7. FN3 First, an inmate must file a complaint with the facility's IGP clerk within a certain number of days of the alleged occurrence. FN4 If a grievance complaint form is not readily available, a complaint may be submitted on plain paper. A representative of the facility's inmate grievance resolution committee ("IGRC") has a certain number of days from receipt of the grievance to informally resolve the issue. If there is no such informal resolution, then the full IGRC conducts a hearing within a certain number of days of receipt of the grievance, and issues a written decision within a certain number of days of the conclusion of the hearing. Second, a grievant may appeal the IGRC decision to the facility's superintendent within a certain number of days of receipt of the IGRC's written decision. The superintendent is to issue a written decision within a certain number of days of receipt of the grievant's appeal. Third, a grievant may appeal to the central office review committee ("CORC") within a certain number of days of receipt of the superintendent's written decision. CORC is to render a written decision within a certain number of days of receipt of the appeal.

Moreover, there is an expedited process for the review of complaints of inmate harassment or other misconduct by corrections officers or prison employees. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.8. In the event the inmate seeks expedited review, he or she may report the misconduct to the employee's supervisor. The inmate then files a grievance under the normal procedures outlined above, but all grievances alleging employee misconduct are given a grievance number, and sent immediately to the superintendent for review. Under the regulations, the superintendent or his designee shall determine immediately whether the allegations, if true, would

state a "bona fide" case of harassment, and if so, shall initiate an investigation of the complaint, either "in-house" (by the Inspector General's Office) or by the New York State Police Bureau of Criminal Investigations. An appeal of the adverse decision of the superintendent may be taken to the CORC as in the regular grievance procedure. A similar "special" procedure is provided for claims of discrimination against an inmate. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.9.

[4] It is important to note that these procedural requirements contain several safeguards. For example, if an inmate could not file such a complaint within the required time period after the alleged occurrence, he or she could apply to the facility's IGP Supervisor for an exception to the time limit based on mitigating circumstances. If that application was denied, the inmate could file a complaint complaining that the application was wrongfully denied. $\stackrel{FN5}{}$ Moreover, any failure by the IGRC or the superintendent to timely respond to a grievance or first-level appeal, respectively, can-and must-be appealed to the next level, including CORC, to complete the grievance process. FN6 There appears to be a conflict in case law regarding whether the IGRC's nonresponse must be appealed to the superintendent where the plaintiff's grievance was never assigned a grievance number. FN / After carefully reviewing this case law, the Court finds that the weight of authority (and better-reasoned authority) answers this question in the affirmative. FN8 The Court notes that, if the plaintiff adequately describes, in his appeal to the superintendent, the substance of his grievance (or if the plaintiff attaches, to his appeal, a copy of his grievance), and the plaintiff adequately describes the failure to process the grievance, there is something for the superintendent to review.

*3 It is also important to note that DOCCS has a *separate and distinct* administrative appeal process for inmate misbehavior hearings:

A. For Tier III superintendent hearings, the

appeal is to the Commissioner's designee, Donald Selsky, D.O.C.S. Director of Special Housing/Inmate Disciplinary Program, pursuant to 8 N.Y.C.R.R. § 254.8;

B. For Tier II disciplinary hearings, the appeal is to the facility superintendent pursuant to 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 253.8; and

C. For Tier I violation hearings, the appeal is to the facility superintendent or a designee pursuant to 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 252.6.

"An individual decision or disposition of any current or subsequent program or procedure having a written appeal mechanism which extends review to outside the facility shall be considered nongrievable." 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.3(e)(1). Similarly, "an individual decision or disposition resulting from a disciplinary proceeding ... is not grievable." 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.3(e)(2). However, "[t]he policies, rules, and procedures of any program or procedure, including those above, are grievable." 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.3(e)(3); see also N.Y. Dep't Corr. Serv. Directive No. 4040 at III.E.

[5] Generally, if a prisoner has failed to properly follow each of the required three steps of the above-described grievance procedure prior to commencing litigation, he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies, and his claims are subject to dismissal. Woodford, 548 U.S. at 93; Porter, 534 U.S. at 524; Ruggiero v. County of Orange, 467 F.3d 170, 175 (2d Cir.2006). However, a plaintiff's failure to exhaust does not end the inquiry. The Second Circuit has held that a three-part inquiry is appropriate where a defendant contends that a prisoner has failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies, as required by the PLRA. Hemphill v. State of New York, 380 F.3d 680, 686, 691 (2d Cir.2004), accord, Ruggiero, 467 F.3d at 175. First, "the court must ask whether [the] administrative remedies [not pursued by the prisoner] were in fact 'available' to the prisoner." Hemphill, 380 F.3d at 686 (citation omitted). Second, if those remedies were available, "the court

should ... inquire as to whether [some or all of] the defendants may have forfeited the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it ... or whether the defendants' own actions inhibiting the [prisoner's] exhaustion of remedies may estop one or more of the defendants from raising the plaintiff's failure to exhaust as a defense." Id. [citations omitted]. Third, if the remedies were available and some of the defendants did not forfeit, and were not estopped from raising, the non-exhaustion defense, "the Court should consider whether 'special circumstances' have been plausibly alleged that justify the prisoner's failure to comply with the administrative procedural requirements." Id. [citations and internal quotations omitted1.

*4 [6] With regard to this third inquiry, the Court notes that, under certain circumstances, an inmate may exhaust his administrative remedies by raising his claim during a related disciplinary proceeding. Giano v. Goord, 380 F.3d 670, 678-79 (2d Cir.2004); *Johnson v. Testman*, 380 F.3d 691, 697 (2d Cir.2004). However, in essence, the circumstances in question include instances in which (1) the inmate reasonably believed that his "only available remedy" was to raise his claim as part of a tier disciplinary hearing, FN10 and (2) the inmate articulated and pursued his claim in the disciplinary proceeding in a manner that afforded prison officials the time and opportunity to thoroughly investigate that claim. FN11 Some district courts have found the first requirement not present where (a) there was nothing objectively confusing about the DOCCS regulations governing the grievability of his claim, (b) the inmate was specifically informed that the claim in question was grievable, (c) the inmate separately pursued the proper grievance process by filing a grievance with the IGRC, (d) by initially alleging that he did appeal his claim to CORC (albeit without proof), the inmate has indicated that, during the time in question, he understood the correct procedure for exhaustion, and/or (e) before and after the incident in question, the inmate pursued similar claims

through filing a grievance with the IGRC. FN12 Other district courts have found the second requirement not present where (a) the inmate's mention of his claim during the disciplinary hearing was so insubstantial that prison officials did not subsequently investigate that claim, and/or (b) the inmate did not appeal his disciplinary hearing conviction.

[7][8][9] Finally, two additional points bear mentioning regarding exhaustion hearings. First, the Second Circuit has ruled that a plaintiff in a lawsuit governed by PLRA is not entitled to a jury trial on disputed factual issues relating to his exhaustion of administrative remedies; rather, PLRA exhaustion is a matter of judicial administration. Messa v. Goord, 652 F.3d 305, 308-10 (2d Cir.2011). Second, given that nonexhaustion is an affirmative defense, the defendant bears the burden of showing that a prisoner has failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies. FN14 However, once a defendant has adduced reliable evidence that administrative remedies were available to the plaintiff and that the plaintiff nevertheless failed to exhaust those administrative remedies, the plaintiff must then "counter" the defendant's assertion by showing exhaustion, unavailability, estoppel, or "special circumstances." $\overset{FN15}{}$ As a result, practically speaking, while the burden on this affirmative defense remains at all times on the defendant, the plaintiff may sometimes have to adduce evidence in order to defeat it.

II. ANALYSIS

As an initial matter, the Court finds that, before filing this action on April 17, 2006, Plaintiff failed to follow each of the required three steps of the grievance procedure described above in Part I of this Decision and Order. In making this finding, the Court relies on the following evidence: (1) Plaintiff's verified Complaint (Dkt. No. 1, at ¶¶ 4.a., 4.b., 4.c.); (2) the Hearing Exhibits including Exhibits D-10, D-11, D-17, D-18, D-19, P-10-a, and P-10-b; (3) the hearing testimony of Sergeant

Murray (Hrg. Tr. at 7–17); (4) the hearing testimony of Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter (*id.* at 18–56); (5) the hearing testimony of Inmate Grievance Program Director Bellamy (*id.* at 56–70); and (6) the hearing testimony of Plaintiff (*id.* at 71–93).

*5 [10] The Court notes that there is no exhaustion where an inmate complains directly to the Inspector General (i.e., instead of complaining to the superintendent and having the complaint referred to the Inspector General pursuant to 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.8[d]), the Inspector General renders a finding of unsubstantiation, and the inmate fails to appeal that finding to CORC.

As a result, the Court proceeds to the three-part inquiry established by the Second Circuit for when a defendant contends that a prisoner has failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies, as required by the PLRA. *See, supra,* Part I of this Decision and Order.

A. Availability of Administrative Remedies

After carefully considering the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Court finds that administrative remedies were "available" to Plaintiff during the time in question. The Court makes this finding for the following six reasons.

[11] First, Hearing Exhibits D-8 and D-9 (containing copies of the version of Directive 4040 that was in effect at the time in question) mandate the existence of a grievance program at Auburn C.F. during the time in question. (See Hrg. Exs. D-8, D-9.) Second, at the hearing on September 19, 2013, Sergeant Murray and Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter testified credibly that there was a working grievance program at Auburn C.F. during the time in question, of which inmates at Auburn C.F. (including Plaintiff) were aware (including through an orientation program, the law library, and grievance clerks). (See, e.g., Hrg. Tr. at 31-33, 58.) Third, in his verified Complaint, Plaintiff stated, "Yes," in response to the question, "Is there a prisoner grievance procedure at [his place of present confinement, i.e., Auburn C.F.]." (Dkt. No. 1, at ¶ 4.a.) Fourth, the relevant portions of Plaintiff's hearing testimony acknowledge that there was a working grievance program at Auburn C.F. during the time in question, and that he had filed more than 40 grievances before the time in question. (See Hrg. Tr. at 63, 74-76, 79-80; Hrg. Ex. D-11.) Fifth, while Plaintiff claims that he "had not been made aware of the procedures for filing a formal complaint against the facility's superintendent" during the time in question, the Court finds that claim to be both incredible and immaterial for the reasons set forth below in Part II .C.2. of this Decision and Order. Sixth and finally, while Plaintiff claims that an "IGRC's supervisor" told him that a new prisoner does not file a grievance at Auburn C.F. if it pertains to the prisoner's previous facility, the Court finds that claim to be both incredible and immaterial for the reasons set forth below in Part II .C.3. of this Decision and Order.

B. Forfeiture/Estoppel

After carefully considering the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Court finds that Defendants did not forfeit the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it, or that Defendants are estopped from raising the defense by taking actions that inhibited Plaintiff's exhaustion of remedies.

*6 With regard to the forfeiture issue, Defendant's Answer timely asserted this affirmative defense, and Plaintiff's counsel made no argument regarding forfeiture at the hearing. (Dkt. No. 34, at 3; see generally Hr. Tr.)

[12][13] With regard to the estoppel issue, a defendant in a prisoner civil rights action may not be estopped from asserting the affirmative defense of failure to exhaust administrative remedies (for purposes of the second part of the three-part inquiry established by the Second Circuit) based on the actions or inactions of *other* individuals. Here, Plaintiff failed to offer sufficient credible evidence at the hearing that it was *Defendants* (as

opposed to someone else) who purportedly inhibited Plaintiff from filing grievances during the time in question. (Hrg. Tr. at 71–93.) For example, while Defendant Kelly has acknowledged having recommended Plaintiff's transfer (see Hrg. Ex. P-6), Plaintiff has not persuaded the Court that, at some unidentified time, Kelly contacted one or more unidentified correctional officers at Auburn C.F. and somehow persuaded them to threaten and/ or intimidate Plaintiff not to exhaust his administrative remedies (or even that it was those communications, as opposed to something else, that caused Plaintiff not to exhaust his administrative remedies). (See id; see also Hrg. Tr. at 72, 78, 84-85, 94-95, 97.) Having observed Plaintiff's demeanor during the hearing, and noticed the vagueness of his testimony on the subject of Kelly's contact with Auburn C.F., the Court finds that testimony to be incredible. $\stackrel{FN18}{\text{FN}}$

Moreover, the Court finds that the recommendation of the transfer, in and of itself, did not inhibit Plaintiff from filing grievances during the time in question. Setting aside the fact that the recommendation required approval in order for the transfer to occur, Plaintiff (purportedly) filed grievances following his transfer. (See, e.g., Hrg. Exs. P-10-b, D-17.) More importantly, again, having observed Plaintiff's demeanor during the hearing, the Court finds his testimony on the subject of causation to be incredible.

C. Special Circumstances

Liberally construed, Plaintiff's original Complaint, hearing testimony and oral argument argue that the following four facts, either by themselves or combined, constitute special circumstances justifying his failure to properly exhaust his available administrative remedies before filing this action on April 17, 2006.

First, Plaintiff argues, through his transfer to Auburn C.F., his placement in S.H.U. and the remarks made to him by Auburn C.F. Captain John Rourke on March 17, 2006, he felt threatened to not fully grieve his retaliatory transfer and placement in

S.H.U. (See Hrg. Tr. at 72–74, 78, 84–87, 90–91; Hrg. Ex. D–14, at ¶ 14.)

Second, Plaintiff argues, he "had not been made aware of the procedures for filing a formal complaint against the facility's superintendent." (*See* Dkt. No. 1, at ¶ 4.b.; Hrg. Tr. at 84.)

*7 Third, Plaintiff argues, upon his admission to Auburn C.F., the "IGRC's supervisor" told him that a new prisoner does not file a grievance at Auburn C.F. if it pertains to the prisoner's previous facility, but that the new prisoner should file that grievance at his previous facility. (Hrg. Tr. at 88–89.)

Fourth and finally, Plaintiff argues, he has "substantially complied" with the grievance process. (Hrg. Tr. at 96-98.) More specifically, he argues that he submitted the following complaints regarding his claim of retaliatory transfer and placement in the Auburn C.F. Special Housing Unit ("S.H.U."): (1) his Inmate Grievance Complaint dated April 28, 2006, complaining of his retaliatory transfer and placement in the Auburn C.F. S.H.U. (see Hrg. Ex. P-10-b; Hrg. Tr. at 74-76, 79); (2) his complaint to the Inspector General's Office, dated June 2, 2006, complaining (buried in a single line of a three-page document) that "I wrote what I saw to several people and then they moved me out" (see Hrg. Ex. D-17); (3) his Inmate Grievance Complaint dated October 15, 2010, complaining of his retaliatory transfer and placement in the Auburn C.F. S.H.U. (see Hrg. Exs. P-10-a, P.-10-b; Hrg. Tr. at 76–78); FN19 (4) his letter to the Auburn C.F. Deputy Superintendent of Program Services Thomas dated November 8, 2010, complaining that he had not received an acknowledgment of the receipt of his grievance of October 15, 2010 (see Hrg. Ex. P-10-a; Hrg. Tr. at 76-78); (5) his letter to Deputy Commissioner of Facilities Operations Lucien J. LeClaire dated November 9, 2010, complaining that his grievance of October 15, 2010, had not yet been acted on; and (6) his two letters to Auburn C.F. Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter dated December 2, 2010, and January 6, 2011, complaining that his grievance of October 15, 2010, had not yet been acted on (*see* Hrg. Ex. P10–b; Hrg. Tr. at 76–78). Moreover, Plaintiff argues, he received a response from the highest of the three levels in the grievance process, i.e., the Central Office Review Committee, through his receipt of a letter of November 29, 2010, from Inmate Grievance Program Director Bellamy (*see* Hrg. Ex. P–10–a; Hrg. Tr. at 96–98).

1. Purported Threats and/or Intimidation

[14] After carefully considering the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Court finds that this excuse does not constitute special circumstances justifying his failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies (either by itself or combined with the evidence discussed elsewhere in Part II.C. of this Decision and Order).

As explained above in Part II.B. of this Decision and Order, the Court finds that the transfer and placement in S.H.U. did not inhibit Plaintiff from filing grievances during the time in question. As for the transfer, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint reveals that, at some point before February 27, 2006, Plaintiff wrote to the superintendent of Great Meadows C.F. and actually requested a transfer (undermining his claim his transfer instilled in him a chilling fear). (Dkt. No. 10, at ¶ 13.) As for the placement in S.H.U., it appears Plaintiff's stay in S.H.U. lasted only one day. (See Hrg. Ex. D-14, at ¶¶ 13, 14; Hrg. Tr. at 90.) As for the remarks made by Captain Rourke on March 17, 2006, for the sake of brevity, the Court will not linger on the vague and general nature of those remarks or the fact that, within six weeks of hearing them, Plaintiff (purportedly) filed a grievance. (See, e.g., Hrg. Tr. at 85; Hrg. Exs. P-10-b, D-17.) More important is the fact that, having observed Plaintiff's demeanor during the hearing, the Court finds his testimony on the subject of causation to be incredible.

2. Purported Lack of Awareness

*8 [15] After carefully considering the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Court finds

that this excuse does not constitute special circumstances justifying his failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies (either by itself or combined with the evidence discussed elsewhere in Part II.C. of this Decision and Order).

The lack of awareness asserted by Plaintiff is the lack of awareness of "the procedures for filing a formal complaint against the facility's superintendent." (See Dkt. No. 1, at ¶ 4.b.; Hrg. Tr. at 84.) However, neither Defendant Kelly nor Defendant Levine was a facility superintendent during the time in question. (Hrg. Tr. at 84.) As a result, the lack of awareness in question is completely immaterial to why Plaintiff did not exhaust his administrative remedies regarding the claim asserted in this action.

Moreover, at the hearing, Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter, and Inmate Grievance Program Director Bellamy testified credibly that inmates at Auburn C.F. were informed of the grievance procedure at Auburn C.F. during the time in question (including through an orientation program). (See, e.g., Hrg. Tr. at 31-32, 58.) Furthermore, the grievance procedure (which was set forth Hgr. Exs. D-8 and D-9) was readily available to Plaintiff (who considered himself to be a "prison litigator") through both the law library and grievance clerks. (See Hrg. Exs. D-8, D-9; Hrg. Tr. at 32–33, 79.) Indeed, at the hearing, Plaintiff admitted that he had filed more than 40 grievances before the time in question. (See Hrg. Tr. at 63, 79-80; Hrg. Ex. D-11.) Based on these facts and Plaintiff's demeanor during the hearing, the Court finds his testimony on this (purported) lack of awareness to be incredible

3. Purported Misinformation

[16] After carefully considering the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Court finds that this excuse does not constitute special circumstances justifying his failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies (either by itself or combined with the evidence discussed elsewhere in Part II.C. of this Decision and Order).

At the hearing, Plaintiff does not identify the name the "IGRC's supervisor" who purportedly told him that a new prisoner does not file a grievance at Auburn C.F. if it pertains to the prisoner's previous facility, nor does he specify the date, means or location of this purported communication. (Hrg. Tr. at 88–89.) Based on this fact and Plaintiff's demeanor during the hearing, the Court finds his testimony on the subject of the (purported) receipt of this misinformation to be incredible.

In any event, even if the Court believed that Plaintiff had received this misinformation, the Court would have difficulty believing that the misinformation would have persuaded experienced "prisoner litigator" such as Plaintiff to disregard the plain language of the April 16, 2004, Revision to DOCCS Directive 4040, which expressly stated, "The complaint may only be filed at the facility where the inmate is housed even if it pertains to another facility " (see Hrg. Ex. D-9 [emphasis in original]), which was followed at Auburn C.F. during the time in question (see Hrg. Tr. at 26-28, 59-60). Again, that Revision was both communicated and available to Plaintiff. (See Hrg. Tr. at 31-33, 58.) Furthermore, Plaintiff does not even argue that, in reliance on the alleged misinformation, he tried to file a grievance at Great Meadows C.F. $\stackrel{FN20}{\text{-}}$

4. Purported Substantial Compliance

***9** As initial matter. "substantial compliance" does not appear to be a fair characterization of the standard set forth in the third part of the three-part inquiry established by the Second Circuit. See, supra, Part I of this Decision and Order. Such a construction would appear to violate the PLRA. FN21 It would also appear to violate Woodford v. Ngo, which held that PLRA exhaustion requires proper exhaustion. Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 92, 126 S.Ct. 2378, 165 L.Ed.2d 368 (2006). In any event, Plaintiff's failures cannot be viewed as insubstantial noncompliance. See, e.g., Wilkinson v. Banks, 02-CV-0361, 2007 WL 2693636, at *10 (W.D.N.Y. Sept.10, 2007)

("Wilkinson's failure to file his appeal with the Clerk should not be viewed as insubstantial noncompliance.").

Out of special solicitude to Plaintiff, the Court will liberally construe his special-circumstances argument as arguing that, when taken together with the three previously discussed excuses proffered by him, his (alleged) unsuccessful attempts to file a timely grievance and appeal the denial of that grievance all the way to CORC justify his failure to comply with the administrative procedural requirements. After carefully considering the matter, the Court rejects this argument for the following three reasons.

First, the Court does not believe that Plaintiff ever submitted his Inmate Grievance Complaint dated April 28, 2006. In rendering this finding, the Court relies on the following: (1) the fact that Plaintiff's (purported) grievance contains no grievance number (Hrg.Ex. P-10-b); (2) Plaintiff's sworn statement that he never filed a grievance with either the IGRC or Superintendent at Auburn C.F. (Dkt. No. 1, at ¶¶ 4.b., 4.c.); (3) the absence of the grievance from DOCCS' records of Plaintiff's grievances (Hrg.Exs.D-10, D-11); (4) the Court's evaluation of Sergeant Murray' credibility during his hearing testimony (Hrg. Tr. at 7–17); (5) the Court's evaluation of Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter's credibility during her hearing testimony (id. at 18–56); (6) the Court's evaluation of Inmate Grievance Program Director Bellamy's credibility during her hearing testimony (id. at 56–70); and (7) the Court's evaluation of Plaintiff's lack of credibility during his hearing testimony (id. at 71-93).

Second, none of the (alleged) grievances and complaints relied on by Plaintiff were dated within fourteen (14) calendar days of the transfer and placement in S.H.U. on March 16, 2006, as required by DOCCS Directive 4040. (Hrg.Exs.D–8, D–9.) Rather, those grievances and complaints were (allegedly)filed on the following three dates: April 28, 2006; June 2, 2006; and October 15, 2010.

(Hrg.Exs.P-10-a, P-10-b, D-17.) Moreover, none of those grievances and complaints was either preceded or accompanied by an application to Auburn C.F. Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter for an exception to the time limit based on mitigating circumstances (which is the procedure described above in Part I of this Decision and Order).

*10 Granted, the submission of the Inmate Grievance Complaint dated October 15, 2010, was followed by letters to supervisors complaining that the grievance had not been acted on. (See Hrg. Ex. P-10-a, P-10-b.) However, those letters do not constitute complaints that an application for an extension of time was wrongfully denied. (Indeed, as explained in the preceding paragraph, there had been no such application.) Rather, those letters (which were addressed to Auburn C.F. Deputy Superintendent of Program Services Thomas, Deputy Commissioner of Facilities Operations LeClaire, and Auburn C.F. Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter) complain that Plaintiff's Inmate Grievance Complaint of October 15, 2010, was never processed, essentially constituting an appeal from that decision. However, none of those letters was filed with the proper person (i.e., Auburn C.F. Superintendent). Even if they had been so filed, they could not achieve exhaustion, because, as explained by Inmate Grievance Supervisor Parmiter in her letter of November 12, 2010, Plaintiff's Inmate Grievance Complaint of October 15, 2010, was rejected for being more than four-and-a-half years late. (Hrg.Ex. P-10-b.) Nor could exhaustion have been achieved through the letter of November 29, 2010, from Inmate Grievance Program Director Bellamy, who did not address the merits of Plaintiff's grievance. (Hrg.Ex. P10-a.)

[17] It would eviscerate the exhaustion requirement to deem an inmate to have exhausted his available administrative remedies where he files a grievance four-and-a-half years late (while litigation is pending), then skips the superintendent

and appeals the rejection of his grievance (based on untimeliness) to CORC, which never passes on the merits of his grievance. If exhaustion were permissible under such circumstances, every inmate could exhaust his available administrative remedies without fulfilling the functions of the exhaustion requirement: affording corrections officials the time and opportunity to quickly and economically correct its own mistakes internally, and producing a useful record for litigation, before allowing the initiation of a federal case. *See, supra*, Part I of this Decision and Order.

Third, none of the three grievances and complaints relied on by Plaintiff was filed before he filed his Complaint in this action on April 17, 2006. Moreover, while Plaintiff's (alleged) Inmate Grievance Complaint dated April 28, 2006, and letter to the Inspector General dated June 2, 2006, predate his Amended Complaint on December 1, 2006 (see Dkt. No. 10, at 8), Plaintiff did not complete the exhaustion process with regard to either of those documents. The (alleged) nonprocessing of the first document was never appealed (in a timely fashion or otherwise) to the Superintendent and then CORC. Furthermore, the second document was neither caused by a referral by the Superintendent nor followed by an appeal to CORC (again, in a timely fashion or otherwise). To characterize Inmate Grievance Program's letter of November 29, 2010 (which expressly regarded Plaintiff's Inmate Grievance Complaint dated October 15, 2010), as an affirmance of either of the two documents dated 2006 would make a mockery of the exhaustion process.

*11 Simply stated, Plaintiff knew the procedure; he simply did not follow it.

ACCORDINGLY, it is

ORDERED that, pursuant to note 1 of this Decision and Order, the Clerk of the Court shall amend the caption of the docket sheet in this action to reflect that the last name of Defendant "Levine" is actually spelled "Leavens"; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 10) is *DISMISSED* in its **entirety without prejudice** for failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies before filing this action, pursuant to the PLRA; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment for Defendants and close the file in this action.

FN1. At the hearing in this action on September 19, 2013, defense counsel represented to the Court that the name of Defendant "Levine" is actually spelled "Leavens." (Hrg. Tr. at 3.) This representation is consistent with the Acknowledgment of Service filed in this action on February 26, 2007. (Dkt. No. 17, at 2.) As a result, the Clerk of the Court is directed to amend the docket sheet accordingly.

FN2. Although Plaintiff's original Complaint was docketed on April 25, 2006, it is dated (and thus deemed "filed" pursuant to the Prison Mailbox Rule) April 17, 2006. (Dkt. No. 1, at 10; Hrg. Tr. at 80.) See Self v. La Valley, 10–CV–1463, 2013 WL 1294448, at *3, n. 8 (N.D.N.Y. March 27, 2013) (Suddaby, J.).

FN3. See also Murray v. Palmer, 03–CV–1010, 2010 WL 1235591, at *1 & n. 1 (N.D.N.Y. March 31, 2010) [citation omitted].

FN4. The Court uses the term "a certain number of days" rather than a particular time period because (1) since the threestep process was instituted, the time periods imposed by the process have changed, and (2) the time periods governing any particular grievance depend on the regulations and directives pending during the time in question.

FN5. See Murray v. Palmer, 03–CV–1010, 2010 WL 1235591, at *2 & n. 3 (N.D.N.Y. March 31, 2010) (citing Groves v. Knight, 05–CV–0183, Decision and Order at 3 [N.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 4, 2009], an appeal from which was subsequently dismissed as frivolous, see Groves v. Knight, No. 09–3641, Mandate [2d Cir. filed Jan. 15, 2010].)

FN6. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.6(g) ("[M]atters not decided within the time limits may be appealed to the next step."); *see also Murray*, 2010 WL 1235591, at *2 & n. 4 [collecting cases].

FN7. *Murray*, 2010 WL 1235591, at *2 & n. 5 [citing cases].

FN8. See, e.g., Rosado v. Fessetto, 09-CV-0067, 2010 WL 3808813, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. Aug.4, 2010) (Baxter, M.J.) ("Courts have consistently held ... that an inmate's general claim that his grievance was lost or destroyed does not excuse the exhaustion requirement."), adopted by 2010 WL 3809991 (N.D.N.Y. Sept.21, 2010) (Hurd, J.); Murray v. Palmer, 03-CV-1010, 2008 WL 2522324, at * 15, 18 & n. 46 (N.D.N.Y. June 20, 2008) (Hurd. J., adopting Report–Recommendation of Lowe, M.J.) ("[E]ven if Great Meadow C.F. did not ... have a functioning grievance-recording process (thus, resulting in Plaintiff's alleged grievance never being responded to), Plaintiff still had the duty to appeal that non-response to the next level."), accord, Midalgo v. Bass, 03-CV-1128, 2006 WL 2795332, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. Sept.26, 2006) (Mordue, C.J., adopting Report–Recommendation of Treece, M.J.) (observing that plaintiff was "requir[ed]" to seek an appeal to the superintendent, even though he never received a response to his grievance of April 26, 2003, which

was never assigned a grievance number); Collins v. Cunningham, 06-CV-0420, 2009 WL 2163214, at *3, 6 (W.D.N.Y. July 20, 2009) (rejecting plaintiff's argument that his administrative remedies were not available where his grievance of March 20, 2004, was not assigned a grievance number); Wesley v. Hardy, 05-CV-6492, 2006 WL 3898199, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Dec.12, 2006) ("If a prisoner submits a grievance and receives no response, he cannot be considered to have been actively obstructed or frustrated, as he is free to appeal to the next level of review."), accord, Walters v. Carpenter, 2004 WL 1403301, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2004); Veloz v. New York, 339 F.Supp.2d 505, 515–16 (S.D.N.Y.2004) (rejecting inmate's argument that prison's grievance procedure had been rendered unavailable by the practice of prison officials' losing or destroying grievances, because, inter alia, he should have "appeal[ed] these claims to the next level once it became clear to him that a response to his initial filing was not forthcoming"); Hernandez v. Coffey, 99-CV-11615, 2003 WL 22241431, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Sept.29, 2003) (rejecting plaintiff's argument that he could not have exhausted because he never received a grievance number, finding he could nonetheless have appealed any such nonresponse to the next level); Reyes v. 206 F.Supp.2d 433 Punzal, 431, (W.D.N.Y.2002) ("Even assuming that plaintiff never received a response to his grievance, he had further administrative avenues of relief open to him."); Hemphill v. New York, 198 F.Supp.2d 546, 549 (S.D.N.Y.2002) ("Had plaintiff utilized this procedure, any failure by Artuz to render a decision on his matter within twelve working days could have been appealed to Albany, thus completing the

grievance cycle and exhausting his remedies in a matter of weeks."), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 380 F.3d 680 (2d Cir.2004); Martinez v. Willaims, 186 F.Supp.2d 353, 357 (S.D.N.Y.2002) ("[P]laintiff now argues in his opposition brief that he filed a grievance in November 1999 and did not receive a response.... Plaintiff's argument that he is excused because defendants failed to act with respect to the grievance is unpersuasive. Plaintiff could have and should have appealed the grievance in accordance with grievance procedures."); Waters Schneider, 01-CV-5217, 2002 WL 727025, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Apr.23, 2002) ("Waters alleges that he attempted to file a grievance with the Inmate Grievance Resolution Committee ... in April 2001 but never received a response.... In either case, it is undisputed that Waters did not pursue the available appeals within the prison grievance system."); cf. Hernandez v. Coffey, 582 F.3d 303, 305, 309, n. 3 (2d Cir.2009) ("Our ruling in no way suggests that we agree with Hernandez's arguments regarding exhaustion or justification for failure to exhaust [which included an argument that the Inmate Grievance Program was not available to him because, when he filed a grievance at the first stage of the Program, he received no response and his grievance was not assigned a grievance number].").

FN9. The Court recognizes that the Supreme Court's decision in *Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 126 S.Ct. 2378, 165 L.Ed.2d 368 (2006), may have changed the law regarding possible exceptions to the exhaustion requirement (and thus the possibility that exhaustion might occur through the disciplinary process). Specifically, in *Woodford*, the Supreme Court held that the PLRA required

"proper" exhaustion as a prerequisite to filing a Section 1983 action in federal court. Woodford, 548 U.S. at 93. "Proper" exhaustion means that the inmate must complete the administrative review process in accordance with the applicable procedural rules, as a prerequisite to bringing suit in federal court. Id. at 88-103 (emphasis added). It is unclear whether Woodford has overruled any decisions that recognize "exceptions" to the exhaustion requirement. Out of special solicitude to Plaintiff, the Court will assume that Woodford has not overruled the Second Circuit's Giano-Testman line of cases.

FN10. Giano, 380 F.3d at 678 ("[W]hile Giano was required to exhaust available administrative remedies before filing suit, his failure to do so was justified by his reasonable belief that DOCS regulations foreclosed such recourse."); Testman, 380 F.3d at 696-98 (remanding case so that district court could consider, inter alia, whether prisoner was justified in believing that his complaints in the disciplinary procedurally exhausted appeal his administrative remedies because the prison's remedial system was confusing).

FN11. *Testman*, 380 F.3d at 696–98 (remanding case so that district court could consider, *inter alia*. whether prisoner's submissions in the disciplinary appeals process exhausted his remedies "in a substantive sense" by "afford[ing] corrections officials time and opportunity to address complaints internally"); *see also Murray*, 2010 WL 1235591, at *3 & n. 9 [citing cases].

FN12. *Murray*, 2010 WL 1235591, at *3 & nn. 10–14 [citing cases].

FN13. *Id.* at *3 & nn. 15–16 [citing cases].

FN14. *Id.* at *4 [citation omitted].

FN15. *Id.* at *4 & n. 17 [citing cases].

FN16. See, e.g., Stephenson v. Dunford, 320 F.Supp.2d 44, 46, 52 (W.D.N.Y.2004) finding no exhaustion where inmate complains directly to Inspector General, Inspector General renders finding of unsubstantiation, and inmate fails to appeal finding to CORC), vacated on other grounds, 139 F. App'x 311 (2d Cir.2005); accord, Johnson ν. Fernandez, 09-CV-0626, 2011 WL 7629513, at *5 (N.D.N.Y. March 1, 2011) (Baxter, M.J.), adopted by 2012 WL 1033652 (N.D.N.Y. Mar 27, 2012) (Scullin, J.); *Jacoby v.* Phelix, 07-CV-0872, 2010 WL 1839299, at *8-9 & n. 15 (N.D.N.Y. March 31, 2010) (Baxter, M.J.), adopted by 2010 WL 1839264 (N.D.N.Y. May 06, 2010) (Hurd, J.); Thomas v. Cassleberry, 315 F.Supp.2d 301, 303-04 (W.D.N.Y.2004); McNair v. Jones, 01-CV-3253, 2002 WL 31082948 at *4, 8 (S.D.N.Y. Sept.18, 2002); Houze v. Segarra, 217 F.Supp.2d 394, 395-96 (S.D.N.Y.2002); Grey v. Spearhawk, 99-CV-9871, 2000 WL 815916, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. June 23, 2000); cf. Ortiz v. Skinner, 00-CV-07220, 2004 2091994, at *1-2 (W.D.N.Y. Sept.16, 2004) ("Director Eagen explains that 'if an inmate or someone on the inmate's behalf complains to the Office of the Inspector General, but the inmate does not file a grievance, the matter is never filed as a grievance and it cannot be appealed to CORC. Of course, the inmate can do both. However, if the inmate chooses to submit a complaint to the Office of the Inspector General and not to file a grievance, then the procedures set forth in Part 701 of Title 7 NYCRR and Directive # 4040 have been completely bypassed, and the inmate has not availed himself or herself of the IGP.'...").

FN17. See, e.g., Murray, 2010 WL 1235591, at *5 & n. 26 [collecting cases]; accord, Bailey v. Fortier, 09-CV-0742, 2013 WL 310306, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Jan.25, 2013) (Sharpe, C.J.); Belile v. Griffin, 11-CV-0092, 2013 WL 1776086, at *9 (N.D.N.Y. Feb.12, 2013) (Peebles, M.J.), adopted by 2013 WL 1291720 (N.D.N.Y. March 27, 2013) (McAvoy, J.); Thompson v. Bellevue Hosp., 09-CV-1038, 2011 WL 4369132, at *12 (N.D.N.Y. Aug.29, 2011) (Lowe, M.J.), adopted by 2011 WL 4369132 (N.D.N.Y. Aug.29, 2011) (Mordue, C.J.); Calloway v. Grimshaw, 09-CV-1354, 2011 WL 4345299, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. Aug.10, 2011) (Lowe, M.J.), adopted by 2011 WL 4345296 (N.D.N.Y. Sep.15, 2011) (McAvoy, J.); McCloud v. Tureglio, 07-CV-0650, 2008 1772305, at * 12 (N.D.N.Y. Apr.15, 2008) (Report-Recommendation of Lowe, M.J., adopted by Mordue, C.J.); Barad v. Comstock, 03-CV-0736, 2005 1579794, at *6 (W.D.N.Y. June 30, 2005). The Court finds that a contrary interpretation of the law would turn the definition of "estoppel" on its head, transforming it—in Orwellian fashion-into one infected by a notion of "vicarious estoppel." See Black's Law Dictionary at 629 (9th ed) (defining "estoppel" as "[a] bar that prevents one from asserting a claim or right that contradicts what one has said or done before....").

FN18. The Court notes that, at the hearing, Plaintiff admitted that, on March 17, 2006, Auburn C.F. Captain Rourke told him, "Listen, *I* had you sent up here [to the Auburn C.F. Special Housing Unit] until I had the chance to talk to you." (Hrg. Tr. at 85 [emphasis added]; *cf.* Hrg. Ex. D–14, at

--- F.Supp.2d ----, 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.) (Cite as: 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.))

¶ 14.)

FN19. The Court does not agree with Plaintiff's counsel that Plaintiff's *four-and-a-half-year* delay in filing his October 15, 2010, grievance regarding the retaliation alleged in this action merely presents "some timing issues." (Hrg. Tr. at 98.)

FN20. The Court notes that, even if Plaintiff had genuinely believed the misinformation, that fact would have had little materiality, because part of the alleged retaliation occurred at Auburn C.F. (enabling him to file a grievance there).

FN21. See Thomas v. New York State DOCS, 00–CV–7163, 2003 WL 22671540, at *3, n. 5 (S.D.N.Y. Nov.10, 2003) ("Such parties are not then excused [from the PLRA's exhaustion requirement] despite their substantial compliance with the DOCS remedial program and their relative persistence."); McCoy v. Goord, 255 F.Supp.2d 233, 246 (S.D.N.Y.2003) ("The standard [under the PLRA] is not one of ... substantial compliance.").

N.D.N.Y.,2013. Smith v. Kelly --- F.Supp.2d ----, 2013 WL 6154366 (N.D.N.Y.)

END OF DOCUMENT



Slip Copy, 2009 WL 3486379 (N.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2009 WL 3486379 (N.D.N.Y.))

C

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,

N.D. New York.
Henry BENITEZ, Plaintiff,
v.
HAM, et al., Defendant.
No. 9:04-CV-1159.

Oct. 21, 2009. Henry Benitez, Malone, NY, for Plaintiff.

Hon. <u>Andrew M. Cuomo</u>, Attorney General for the State of New York, <u>Timothy P. Mulvey</u>, <u>Esq.</u>, of Counsel, Syracuse, NY, for Defendants.

ORDER

NORMAN A. MORDUE, Chief Judge.

*1 The above matter comes to me following a Report-Recommendation by Magistrate Judge George H. Lowe, duly filed on the 30th day of September 2009. Following ten days from the service thereof, the Clerk has sent me the file, including any and all objections filed by the parties herein.

After careful review of all of the papers herein, including the Magistrate Judge's Report-Recommendation, and no objections submitted thereto, it is

ORDERED that:

- 1. The Report-Recommendation is hereby adopted in its entirety.
- 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 92) is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. The following claims are dismissed pursuant to Defendants' motion for summary judgment: (1) the Eighth

Amendment claims against Defendants Weissman and Richards arising from their treatment of Plaintiff's severe body itch, left wrist, and right ankle; (2) the claims against Defendant Ham; (3) the claims against Defendants Brousseau and Donelli for their handling of Plaintiff's grievance regarding Defendant Ham; (4) the retaliation claim against Defendants Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder based on their filing of misbehavior reports against Plaintiff; (5) the claims against Defendants Brousseau, Donelli, Girdich, and Eagen regarding their handling of Plaintiff's grievances regarding the events of January 2 and 3, 2003; (6) the claim against Defendant LaClair; (7) the claims against Defendant Bullis; and (8) the Eighth Amendment claim against Defendants Weissman and Girdich for approving the imposition of the loaf diet.

It is further ordered that the following claims are dismissed sua sponte pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B): (1) Plaintiff's retaliation claim against Defendants Weissman and Richards; and (2) the claim against Defendant Selsky.

It is further ordered that the following claims survive summary judgment and sua sponte review and proceed to trial: (1) the conspiracy claim against Defendants Wright, Snyder, and Duprat; (2) the excessive force claim against Defendants Snyder, Duprat, Bogett, and Wright; (3) the retaliation claim against Defendants Snyder, Duprat, Bogett, and Wright arising from the use of excessive force; (4) the retaliation claim against Wright arising from his filing of a misbehavior report against Plaintiff; (5) the failure to intervene claims against Defendants Bezio and Duprat; (6) the retaliation claim against Defendant Bezio; and (7) the Eighth Amendment claims against Defendants Hensel, Goodwin, Kuhlman, and Costello.

3. The Clerk of the Court shall serve a copy of this Order upon all parties and the Magistrate Judge assigned to this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

(Cite as: 2009 WL 3486379 (N.D.N.Y.))

REPORT-RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER

GEORGE H. LOWE, United States Magistrate Judge.

This pro se prisoner civil rights action, commenced pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, has been referred to me for Report and Recommendation by the Honorable Norman A. Mordue, Chief United States District Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 72.3(c). Plaintiff Henry Benitez alleges that 21 employees of the New York Department of Correctional Services ("DOCS") violated his constitutional rights by subjecting him to excessive force, denying him medical care, falsifying misbehavior reports, denying him assistance to prepare for a disciplinary hearing, and imposing a loaf diet on him as punishment. Currently pending before the Court is Defendants' motion for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. (Dkt. No. 92.) For the reasons that follow, I recommend that Defendants' motion be granted in part and denied in part.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL SUMMARY

*2 Unless otherwise noted, the facts in this summary are taken from Plaintiff's verified complaint FNI. Plaintiff, a New York state prisoner, was transferred to Upstate Correctional Facility on September 14, 2002. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 8.) Plaintiff alleges that he was suffering from "ongoing severe pain in his left hand wrist and right foot ankle due to nerve damage." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 9.) From the time he arrived at Upstate, he made "numerous requests" to Defendant Drs. Evelyn Weissman and Richards to receive a medication called Atarax that had been prescribed to him previously at Auburn Correctional Facility, an MRI of his left wrist and right ankle, and a referral to an orthopedist. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 12.) Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Weissman and Richards refused his requests for Atarax, the MRI, and the referral "in retaliation for his having filed numerous formal grievances against them [and other Upstate medical staff members] within a period of two years, and for the purpose of preventing [Plaintiff] from demonstrating in a civil rights action against prison officials the extent of the injuries of his left hand and right foot." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 12-13.) Plaintiff alleges that, as a result, he continues to experience severe pain in his left wrist and right ankle, numbness in different areas of his left hand and right foot, an inability to walk or stand for longer than ten minutes, and ongoing severe body itch. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 14.)

FN1. Only two of the named Defendants filed affidavits supporting Defendants' motion for summary judgment. Only one of those affidavits-the affidavit of Defendant Dr. Evelyn Weissman-contradicts Plaintiff's version of events.

Regarding Plaintiff's requests for <u>Atarax</u>, Dr. Weissman declares that <u>Atarax</u> is

non-formulary, which means we do not regularly stock that medication, and special approval must be obtained to issue that medication. However, Vistaril and Hydroxyzine is the substitute we use for the same purpose as Atarax. Hydroxyzine is the generic form of Atarax. I prescribed Vistaril for [P]laintiff on October 2, 2002 ... Dr. Richards requested approval for Atarax in April 2004 and it was suggested that [P]laintiff try Claritin, which had become a formulary (regularly stocked) drug. Dr. Richards requested approval for Atarax again in June 2004, and the response was that if the generic (Hydroxyzine) had not worked, it was unclear that the branded drug Atarax would work ... Plaintiff's complaints of itching were not ignored, and he [was] constantly given medication for itching.

(Weissman Aff. ¶¶ 4-10.)

As to Plaintiff's other claims, Dr. Weissman declares:

Regarding [P]laintiff's claim that his request for an MRI was denied, Dr. Richards and I felt, in our medical judgment, an MRI was not warranted. However, because his pain and numbness was improving with time, Dr. Richards requested, and I approved, physical therapy for [P]laintiff beginning in January 2003. Regarding [P]laintiff's claim that his request for an orthopedic consult was denied, that is incorrect. Dr. Richards requested an orthopedic consult for [P]laintiff on August 19, 2003 and [P]laintiff saw an orthopedist

on September 4, 2003. The orthopedist ... did not suggest an MRI and determined that [P]laintiff was improving and "... there is not much else that I can suggest for Henry to improve or accelerate his healing. For the time being, I am just going to suggest that he be patient."

*3 (Weissman Aff. ¶¶ 11-13.)

Plaintiff was transferred to Elmira Correctional Facility Reception Center on November 7, 2002, for a court appearance. Upon arrival, Plaintiff informed Defendant Correction Officer Ham that he suffered "ongoing severe pain in his left hand wrist and right foot ankle due to nerve damage, and that the handcuffs and leg irons ... were too tight and causing him swelling and enormous pain." Ham observed that Plaintiff's hands were swollen. However, he refused to remove or loosen the restraints. Plaintiff remained in the restraints, suffering enormous pain and swelling, until he was transferred to Five Points Correctional Facility three hours later. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 9.)

Plaintiff was returned to the Elmira Correctional Facility Reception Center on November 14, 2002. At that time, Plaintiff again informed Defendant Ham that the restraints were too tight and were causing him swelling and extreme pain. Defendant Ham "again verbally acknowledged that [Plaintiff]'s hands were ... swollen" but refused to remove the restraints. Plaintiff remained in the restraints, suffering enormous pain and swelling, until he was transferred out of the facility three hours later. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 10.)

On January 2, 2003, Defendant Correction Officers Nephew and Desotelle strip-frisked Plaintiff FN2 in preparation for transferring Plaintiff for a court appearance. Defendant Sgt. Snyder was also in the room. When they had completed the search, Defendant Nephew ordered Plaintiff to put on his coat. Plaintiff told Nephew that wearing the coat would "severely aggravate his continuing body itch stemming from his hepatitis virus." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 15.) Defendant Snyder called Plaintiff a "spick" and threatened to forcibly put the coat on Plaintiff.

Plaintiff told Defendants Snyder, Nephew, and Desotelle that he would sue them if they used force. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 15.)

FN2. Plaintiff does not allege that the strip-frisk violated his constitutional rights. Even if he did, I would find that such a claim would not survive sua sponte review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Strip searches conducted in a prison setting are constitutional if they are reasonably related to a legitimate penological goal and are conducted in a reasonable manner. Frazier v. Ward, 528 F.Supp. 80, 81 (N.D.N.Y.1981). "However, a strip search is unconstitutional if it is unrelated to any legitimate penological goal or if it is designed to intimidate, harass, or punish. See, e.g., Iqbal v. Hasty, 490 F.3d 143, 172 (2d Cir.2007) (pretrial detainee alleged Fourth Amendment violation where he was subjected to repeated strip and body cavity searches that were not related to legitimate government purposes and designed to punish); Covino, 967 F.2d at 80 (strip search accompanied by physical and verbal abuse is unconstitutional); Hodges v. Stanley, 712 F.2d 34, 35-36 (2d Cir.1983) (second strip search performed soon after a first strip search served no legitimate interest when prisoner was under continuous escort); Jean-Laurent v. Wilkerson, 438 F.Supp.2d 318, 323 (S.D.N.Y.2006)." Miller v. Bailey, No. 05-CV-5493, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31863, at *1, 2008 WL 1787692, at *9 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 17, 2008). Plaintiff does not allege, and the evidence does not show, that Defendants conducted the strip-frisk with an intent to intimidate, harass, or punish Plaintiff.

Shortly thereafter, Defendant Lt. Wright approached Plaintiff and asked him if he had spit at staff. Before Plaintiff could respond, Defendant Wright ordered several guards to get a video camera and put a "spittle mask" on Plaintiff. After the guards did so, Defendant Wright escorted Plaintiff to his cell. He asked Plaintiff to explain what had happened in the frisk room. Plaintiff said that

Defendant Wright would not believe his account of the incident, accused Defendant Wright of interfering with his court trip and unjustifiably putting a spittle mask on him, and said he would sue Defendants Wright and Snyder. Defendant Wright told Plaintiff that "transportation vans don't have cameras. You're going to learn not to spit ... [at] staff and ... threaten us with lawsuits." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 16.)

After Defendant Wright left Plaintiff's cell, Defendant Capt. Bezio approached and asked Plaintiff to explain what happened in the frisk room. Plaintiff told Defendant Bezio what had happened, denied that he had threatened to spit at a staff member, and asked Defendant Bezio to protect him while he was being transported to court. Defendant Bezio told Plaintiff to be "up and ready to go to court" and that "people don't like to get spat ... on." [N3] (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 19.)

FN3. In their motion for summary judgment, Defendants argue that Plaintiff cannot maintain a claim against Defendant Bezio for these statements because (1) Plaintiff did not exhaust his administrative remedies regarding the statements; and (2) threats are not actionable constitutional violations. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 35-36.) In his opposition to the motion, Plaintiff states that he did not intend to maintain a separate claim against Defendant Bezio based on the statements. Rather, he included this allegation in his complaint to provide relevant information for his failure to intervene claim. (Dkt. No. 109 at 48.) Therefore, I will not address Defendants' arguments regarding these statements.

*4 On January 3, 2003, Defendant Correction Officer Duprat escorted Plaintiff to the transportation van. Defendant Duprat told Plaintiff to "remember what we told you about the van." FN4 As they were walking, Plaintiff saw Defendant Bezio and told him that Defendant Duprat had threatened to "employ physical abuse" against him in the van. Defendant Bezio shrugged his shoulders. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 20.) Defendant Duprat drove Plaintiff in a van to a different building, where he called Defendant

Snyder "to arrange a beating" of Plaintiff. After the phone call, Defendant Duprat drove Plaintiff back to the first building. When they arrived, Defendant Snyder entered the rear section of the van and told Plaintiff that "you like ... suing us. Wright, my boss, doesn't like that and sent this as a reminder." Defendant Snyder then punched and slapped Plaintiff, who was in handcuffs and leg irons, in the face and the back of his head, knocking him unconscious. When Plaintiff revived, Defendants Duprat and Correction Officer Bogett entered the rear section of the van and punched and slapped Plaintiff several times in the head, chest, and right ear. When Plaintiff began to bleed from his right inner ear, Defendants Duprat and Bogett tied a spittle mask on Plaintiff's head. (Dkt. No. 1

FN4. In their motion for summary judgment, Defendants argue that Plaintiff cannot maintain a claim against Defendant Duprat for this statement because (1) Plaintiff did not exhaust his administrative remedies regarding the statement; and (2) threats are not actionable constitutional violations. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 35-36.) In his opposition to the motion, Plaintiff states that he did not intend to maintain a separate claim against Defendant Duprat based on the statement. Rather, he included it in his complaint to provide relevant information for his excessive force claim. (Dkt. No. 109 at 48.) Therefore, I will not address Defendants' arguments regarding these statements.

When Plaintiff arrived at Five Points Correctional Facility later that day, he notified Defendant Nurse Hensel that he had been bleeding from his inner right ear due to a beating by Upstate officials, that he was suffering severe pain in his head and right ear, and that he wanted to be examined by a doctor. Defendant Hensel refused to examine Plaintiff, made no record of his complaints, and refused to schedule Plaintiff to see a doctor. FNS (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 23.)

<u>FN5.</u> The medical records produced by Defendants in support of their motion for

summary judgment do not reflect that Plaintiff saw Nurse Hensel on January 3, 2003. However, as the Court has noted previously (Dkt. No. 99 at 3), a SHU log book entry for January 3, 2003, indicates that Plaintiff was "taken to strip frisk room for pictures and to be assessed by R/N Hensel." (Defs.' Resp. to P.'s 1st Req. for Prod. of Docs., Ex. E at 11.) This document corroborates Plaintiff's claim that he saw Defendant Hensel on January 3, 2003. I note, however, that none of the parties included the log book entry in their moving or opposing papers.

Plaintiff's medical record from Five Points indicates that on January 3, 2003, the day he arrived, Plaintiff was seen by Nurse Nancy O'Connor Ryerson. She noted that Plaintiff arrived via van with cuffs and chains and spit net, and that he complained of pain and itching. "It was noted that he takes Naprosyn and Benadryl, and he was escorted to 12 Building. Apparently Naprosyn was not sent with him and it is a medication for which he would need a prescription from a doctor. Since this was not an emergency, the procedure is to place the inmate on the regular physician call-out list for an appointment. Nurse Ryerson also noted that he was Hepatitis C positive." (Bannister Aff. ¶ 5.)

On January 4, 2003, Plaintiff notified Defendant Nurse Goodwin $\frac{FN6}{}$ that he needed emergency medical treatment because of severe pain in his liver, left wrist, and right ear, and that he wanted medicine for his severe body itch. Defendant Goodwin refused to examine Plaintiff, made no record of his complaints, and did not provide any treatment to Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 24.)

<u>FN6.</u> The complaint refers to this defendant as Nurse "Good." However, Defendants state that her name is actually Goodwin. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 1 n. 1.) I will refer to her as Nurse Goodwin.

Plaintiff's medical records from Five Points indicate that on January 4, 2003, Plaintiff was seen by Nurse "Goon" at his cell after security staff told the nurse that Plaintiff stated his asthma was acting up. Nurse "Goon" 's

note indicated that Plaintiff never acknowledged shortness of breath and that she checked Plaintiff's transfer form and the computer and found that he had no history of <u>asthma</u>. (Bannister Aff. \P 6.)

*5 On January 5, 2003, Plaintiff alleges that he informed Defendant Nurse Kuhlman FN7 that he had been bleeding from his inner right ear and that he was suffering from an ongoing, extreme body itch due to his hepatitis C and B virus. Defendant Kuhlman told Plaintiff that she would review his medical chart and return to him. Defendant Kuhlman refused to examine Plaintiff, made no record of his medical complaints, and refused to provide treatment. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 25.)

FN7. The complaint refers to this defendant as Nurse Coleman. As discussed further below, Plaintiff did not serve this defendant. In his opposition to the motion for summary judgment, Plaintiff states that he ultimately learned through discovery that her name is actually Nurse Kuhlman. (Dkt. No. 109 at 6 n. 2.) I will refer to this defendant as Nurse Kuhlman.

Plaintiff's medical records from Five Points show that Defendant Kuhlman saw Plaintiff on January 5, 2003. Her note indicates that she went to his cell for his 4:00 p.m. medications and he complained about the way she distributed the medication $\frac{\text{FN8}}{\text{FN8}}$. He stated that the nurse would be getting a grievance. He was uncooperative and argumentative. (Bannister Aff. ¶ 7.)

FN8. It is not clear what medications Nurse Kuhlman was distributing, since the Affidavit of Linda Bannister establishes that "nurses cannot give medications until they verify allergies and prescription orders" and that as of January 6, the day after Nurse Kuhlman saw Plaintiff, this verification had not been completed. (Bannister Aff. ¶ 8.)

On January 6, 2003, Plaintiff informed Defendant Nurse Costello that he needed treatment due to great pain in his right ear and his ongoing severe body itch.

Defendant Costello refused to examine Plaintiff's right ear, made no record of his medical complaint, and refused to promptly provide medical treatment. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 26.)

Plaintiff's medical records from Five Points show that Defendant Costello saw him on January 6, 2003. She noted that he was complaining that he needed an emergency prescription for severe headache and severe itching. She noted that he requested a prompt examination by a physician. She instructed him that she would have to find the chart or the transfer paperwork because nurses cannot give medications until they verify allergies and prescription orders. (Bannister Aff. ¶ 8.)

Plaintiff's medical records from Five Points show that he was seen again the next day by Defendant Costello. Plaintiff's chart was still not available, and he again requested a prescription for itching, Hepatitis C, and a physical exam. Defendant Costello again noted that she would have to verify his requests and then possibly schedule an appointment. (Bannister Aff. ¶ 9.)

Plaintiff's medical records from Five Points show that he was seen later that day by non-defendant Nurse Gardner at the request of security staff. Plaintiff stated "I was knocked out and beaten everywhere" and claimed that he had a lump on his head. Nurse Gardner examined him and noted no redness, bruising, or bump on head. (Bannister Aff. ¶ 10.)

Plaintiff alleges that Wright, Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder retaliated against him for his threat to sue them by filing false misbehavior reports. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 17-18.) Defendant Correction Officer LaClair was assigned to assist Plaintiff with preparing for the subsequent disciplinary hearing. (Defs.' Ex. 14.)

According to a misbehavior report filed by Defendant LaClair, when he went to Plaintiff's cell to assist him, Plaintiff "stated ... that [LaClair] was to get him what he wanted." Defendant LaClair "informed him that what he needed had to be pertained (sic) to the misbehavior report. [Plaintiff] then stated "Get what I want or I'll fuck you up." Defendant La Clair "informed him the interview was

over and left the area." (Defs.' Ex. 15 at 2-3.) Plaintiff alleges that Defendant LaClair "falsified [the] misbehavior report against [Plaintiff] in order to refrain" from assisting Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 35.)

*6 On January 15, 2003, Defendant Bullis arrived at Plaintiff's cell and informed him that he would conduct the disciplinary hearing that day. He asked Plaintiff whether he wanted to attend the hearing. Plaintiff said that he did not because Defendant LaClair had not assisted him, but asked Defendant Bullis to interview Defendant LaClair and an inmate witness about the events leading to Defendant LaClair's refusal to provide assistance. Plaintiff asked Defendant Bullis not to impose a loaf diet as a punishment if he found Plaintiff guilty because the loaf diet caused Plaintiff severe abdominal pains and constipation due to his hepatitis. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 36.)

Defendant Bullis did not interview Defendant LaClair or the inmate witness. He found Plaintiff guilty and imposed a penalty of 21 days of the loaf diet. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 37.) Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Weissman and Girdich "maliciously" approved the penalty in "reckless disregard" of the pain it would inflict on Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 38.) Plaintiff alleges that "[d]ue to the danger that the ... loaf diet posed" to his well-being, he refused to eat it. As a result, he lost 33 pounds and suffered severe abdominal pains and emotional distress that exacerbated his hepatitis. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 39.)

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Brousseau, Donelli, Selsky, Girdich, and Eagen mishandled the grievances and appeals he filed or attempted to file regarding his claims. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 28-34, 40.)

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit on October 6, 2004. The parties proceeded to discovery, which proved contentious. Plaintiff successfully moved to compel responses to his discovery requests, and thereafter filed four motions for sanctions seeking Defendants' compliance with the order compelling discovery. (Dkt.Nos.56, 73, 94, 103.) I granted each of those motions in part. (Dkt. Nos.62, 79, 99, 107.) As is relevant here, I ruled that because not all of the pages of the Five Points Movement and Control Log Book

for November 14, 2003, had been provided to Plaintiff before the original was destroyed, Plaintiff could ask the Court to draw factual inferences favorable to him. (Dkt. No. 99 at 2.) I ruled that because Defendants could not locate the SHU log book for January 2003, Plaintiff could "ask the Court to draw factual inferences favorable to him based upon the missing pages for January 14, 2003" in opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 99 at 1-2.) I noted that Defendants had told Plaintiff that photographs taken of him on January 10, 2003, would be produced but that, without explanation, Defendants could no longer find the photographs. Accordingly, I ruled that Plaintiff could ask the Court to draw factual inferences favorable to him based upon the missing photographs. (Dkt. No. 99 at 2-3.) I ordered that if photographs taken of Plaintiff on January 3, 2003, no longer existed, Plaintiff could similarly request favorable inferences. (Dkt. No. 99 at 3.)

*7 On March 16, 2009, Plaintiff again moved for sanctions. (Dkt. No. 103.) I noted that the photographs from January 3 and 10, 2003, were still missing. (Dkt. No. 107 at 1.) I reiterated that Plaintiff could ask the Court to draw factual inferences favorable to him based upon the missing photographs. (Dkt. No. 107 at 2.)

Currently pending before the Court is Defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 92.) Plaintiff has opposed the motion. (Dkt. No. 109.)

II. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS

A. Legal Standard Governing Motions for Summary Judgment

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56, summary judgment is warranted if "the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c). The party moving for summary judgment bears the initial burden of showing, through the production of admissible evidence, that no genuine issue of material fact

exists. Major League Baseball Properties, Inc. v. Salvino, Inc., 542 F.3d 290, 309 (2d Cir.2008). Only after the moving party has met this burden is the non-moving party required to produce evidence demonstrating that genuine issues of material fact exist. Salahuddin v. Goord, 467 F.3d 263, 272-73 (2d Cir.2006). The nonmoving party must do more than "rest upon the mere allegations ... of the [plaintiff's] pleading" or "simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts." FN9 Rather, "[a] dispute regarding a material fact is genuine if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." FN10 In determining whether a genuine issue of material FN11 fact exists, the Court must resolve all ambiguities and draw all reasonable inferences against the moving party.

FN9. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 585-86, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986); Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986); see also Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(e) ("When a motion for summary judgment is properly made [by a defendant] and supported [as provided in this rule], the [plaintiff] may not rely merely on allegations ... of the [plaintiffs] pleading ...").

FN10. Ross v. McGinnis, No. 00-CV-0275, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9367, at * 20-21, 2004 WL 1125177, at *8 (W.D.N.Y. Mar.29, 2004) (internal quotations omitted) (emphasis added).

FN11. A fact is "material" only if it would have some effect on the outcome of the suit. <u>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby</u>, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986).

FN12. Schwapp v. Town of Avon, 118 F.3d 106, 110 (2d Cir.1997) (citation omitted); Thompson v. Gjivoje, 896 F.2d 716, 720 (2d Cir.1990) (citation omitted).

B. Legal Standard Governing Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim

To the extent that a defendant's motion for summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 is based entirely on the allegations of the plaintiff's complaint, such a motion is functionally the same as a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). As a result, "[w]here appropriate, a trial judge may dismiss for failure to state a cause of action upon motion for summary judgment." Schwartz v. Compagnise Gen. Transatlantique, 405 F.2d 270, 273-74 (2d Cir.1968) (citations omitted); accord, Katz v. Molic, 128 F.R.D. 35, 37-38 (S.D.N.Y.1989) ("This Court finds that ... a conversion [of a Rule 56 summary judgment motion to a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss the complaint] is proper with or without notice to the parties."). Moreover, even where a defendant has not advanced such a failure-to-state-a-claim argument on a motion for summary judgment, a district court may, sua sponte, address whether a pro se prisoner has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. FN13 For these reasons, it is appropriate to briefly summarize the legal standard governing Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) motions to dismiss.

FN13. The authority to conduct this *sua sponte* analysis is derived from two sources: (1) 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), which provides that "the court shall dismiss [a] case [brought by a prisoner proceeding *in forma pauperis*] at any time if the court determines that ... the action ... is frivolous or malicious[,] ... fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted[,] ... or ... seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief"; and (2) 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b), which provides that, "[o]n review, the court shall ... dismiss the [prisoner's] complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint ... is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted"

*8 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a defendant may move to dismiss a complaint for "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6). It has long been understood that a defendant may base such a motion on either or both of two

grounds: (1) a challenge to the "sufficiency of the pleading" under <u>Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2)</u>; $\frac{FN14}{}$ or (2) a challenge to the legal cognizability 14 of the claim. FN15

FN14. See 5C Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1363 at 112 (3d ed. 2004) ("A motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim for relief under Rule 12(b)(6) goes to the sufficiency of the pleading under Rule 8(a)(2).") (citations omitted); Princeton Indus., Inc. v. Rem, 39 B.R. 140, 143 (Bankr.S.D.N.Y.1984) ("The motion under F.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6) tests the formal legal sufficiency of the complaint as to whether the plaintiff has conformed to F.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2) which calls for a 'short and plain statement' that the pleader is entitled to relief."); Bush v. Masiello, 55 F.R.D. 72, 74 (S.D.N.Y.1972) ("This motion under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6) tests the formal legal sufficiency of the complaint, determining whether the complaint has conformed to Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2) which calls for a 'short and plain statement that the pleader is entitled to relief.").

FN15. See Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506, 514, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1 (2002) ("These allegations give respondent fair notice of what petitioner's claims are and the grounds upon which they rest.... In addition, they state claims upon which relief could be granted under Title VII and the ADEA."); Wynder v. McMahon, 360 F.3d 73, 80 (2d Cir.2004) ("There is a critical distinction between the notice requirements of Rule 8(a) and the requirement, under Rule 12(b)(6), that a plaintiff state a claim upon which relief can be granted."); Phelps v. Kapnolas, 308 F.3d 180, 187 (2d Cir.2002) ("Of course, none of this is to say that a court should hesitate to dismiss a complaint when the plaintiff's allegation ... fails as a matter of law.") (citation omitted); Kittay v. Kornstein, 230 F.3d 531, 541 (2d Cir.2000) (distinguishing

between a failure to meet Rule 12[b][6]'s requirement of stating a cognizable claim and Rule 8[a]'s requirement of disclosing sufficient information to put defendant on fair notice); In re Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether Prods. Liab. Litig., 379 F.Supp.2d 348, 370 (S.D.N.Y.2005) ("Although Rule 8 does not require plaintiffs to plead a theory of causation, it does not protect a legally insufficient claim [under Rule 12(b)(6)].") (citation omitted); Util. Metal Research & Generac Power Sys., Inc., No. 02-CV-6205, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23314, at *4-5, 2004 WL 2613993, at *1-2 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 18, 2004) (distinguishing between the legal sufficiency of the cause of action under Rule 12[b][6] and the sufficiency of the complaint under Rule 8[a]); accord, Straker v. Metro Trans. Auth., 333 F.Supp.2d 91, 101-102 (E.D.N.Y.2004); Tangorre v. Mako's, Inc., No. 01-CV-4430, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1658, at *6-7, 2002 WL 313156 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 30, 2002) (identifying two sorts of arguments made on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion-one aimed at the sufficiency of the pleadings under Rule 8(a), and the other aimed at the legal sufficiency of the claims).

Rule 8(a)(2) requires that a pleading contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2) (emphasis added). By requiring this "showing," Rule 8(a)(2) requires that the pleading contain a short and plain statement that "give[s] the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff's claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." FNI6 The main purpose of this rule is to "facilitate a proper decision on the merits." FNI7 A complaint that fails to comply with this rule "presents far too heavy a burden in terms of defendants' duty to shape a comprehensive defense and provides no meaningful basis for the Court to assess the sufficiency of [plaintiff's] claims." FNI8

FN16. Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo, 544 U.S. 336, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 1634, 161 L.Ed.2d 577 (2005) (holding that the complaint failed to meet this test) (citation omitted; emphasis added); see

also Swierkiewicz, 534 U.S. at 512 (citation omitted); Leathernman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit, 507 U.S. 163, 168, 113 S.Ct. 1160, 122 L.Ed.2d 517 (1993) (citation omitted).

FN17. Swierkiewicz, 534 U.S. at 514 (quoting Conley, 355 U.S. at 48); see also Simmons v. Abruzzo, 49 F.3d 83, 86 (2d Cir.1995) ("Fair notice is that which will enable the adverse party to answer and prepare for trial, allow the application of res judicata, and identify the nature of the case so it may be assigned the proper form of trial.") (citation omitted); Salahuddin v. Cuomo, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir.1988) ("[T]he principle function of pleadings under the Federal Rules is to give the adverse party fair notice of the claim asserted so as to enable him to answer and prepare for trial.") (citations omitted).

FN18. Gonzales v. Wing, 167 F.R.D. 352, 355 (N.D.N.Y.1996) (McAvoy, J.), aff'd, 113 F.3d 1229 (2d Cir.1997) (unpublished table opinion); accord, Hudson v. Artuz, 95-CV-4768, 1998 WL 832708, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Nov.30, 1998), Flores v. Bessereau, No. 98-CV-0293, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8750, 1998 WL 315087, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. June 8, 1998) (Pooler, J.). Consistent with the Second Circuit's application of § 0.23 of the Rules of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, I cite this unpublished table opinion, not as precedential authority, but merely to show the case's subsequent history. See, e.g., Photopaint Technol., LLC v. Smartlens Corp., 335 F.3d 152, 156 (2d Cir.2003) (citing, for similar purpose, unpublished table opinion of Gronager v. Gilmore Sec. & Co., 104 F.3d 355 (2d Cir.1996)).

"To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter ... to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.' A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that

allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. The plausibility standard is not akin to a probability requirement, but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully." <u>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</u>, --- U.S. ----, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009) (quoting <u>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</u>, 550 U.S. 544, 556-57, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007)). Accordingly, "where the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged-but has not shown-that the pleader is entitled to relief." <u>Iqbal</u>, 129 S.Ct. at 1950 (emphasis added).

It should also be emphasized that, "[i]n reviewing a complaint for dismissal under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6), the court must accept the material facts alleged in the complaint as true and construe all reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor." FN19 "This standard is applied with even greater force where the plaintiff alleges civil rights violations or where the complaint is submitted pro se. "FN20 In other words, while all pleadings are to be construed liberally under Rule 8(e), pro se civil rights pleadings are to be construed with an extra degree of liberality.

FN19. Hernandez v. Coughlin, 18 F.3d 133, 136 (2d Cir.1994) (affirming grant of motion to dismiss) (citation omitted); Sheppard v. Beerman, 18 F.3d 147, 150 (2d Cir.1994).

FN20. Hernandez, 18 F.3d at 136 (citation omitted); Deravin v. Kerik, 335 F.3d 195, 200 (2d Cir.2003) (citations omitted); Vital v. Interfaith Med. Ctr., 168 F.3d 615, 619 (2d Cir.1999) (citation omitted).

For example, the mandate to read the papers of *pro se* litigants generously makes it appropriate to consider a plaintiff's papers in opposition to a defendant's motion to dismiss as effectively amending the allegations of the plaintiff's complaint, to the extent that those factual assertions are consistent with the allegations of the plaintiff's complaint. FN21 Moreover, "courts must construe *pro se* pleadings broadly, and interpret them to raise the

strongest arguments that they suggest." FN22 Furthermore, when addressing a *pro se* complaint, *generally* a district court "should not dismiss without granting leave to amend at least once when a liberal reading of the complaint gives any indication that a valid claim might be stated." FN23 Of course, an opportunity to amend is not required where the plaintiff has already amended his complaint. FN24 In addition, an opportunity to amend is not required where "the problem with [plaintiff's] causes of action is substantive" such that "[b]etter pleading will not cure it."

FN21. "Generally, a court may not look outside the pleadings when reviewing a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. However, the mandate to read the papers of pro se litigants generously makes it appropriate to consider plaintiff's additional materials, such as his opposition memorandum." Gadson v. Goord, No. 96-CV-7544, U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18131 1997 WL 714878, at * 1, n. 2, 1997 (S.D.N.Y. Nov.17, 1997) (citing, inter alia, Gil v. Mooney, 824 F.2d 192, 195 [2d Cir.1987] [considering plaintiff's response affidavit on motion to dismiss]). Stated another way, "in cases where a pro se plaintiff is faced with a motion to dismiss, it is appropriate for the court to consider materials outside the complaint to the extent they 'are consistent with the allegations in the complaint." " Donhauser v. Goord, 314 F.Supp.2d 119, 212 (N.D.N.Y.2004) (considering factual allegations contained in plaintiff's opposition papers) (citations omitted), vacated in part on other grounds, 317 F.Supp.2d 160 (N.D.N.Y.2004). This authority is premised, not only on case law, but on Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which permits a plaintiff, as a matter of right, to amend his complaint once at any time before the service of a responsive pleading-which a motion to dismiss is not. See Washington v. James, 782 F.2d 1134, 1138-39 (2d Cir.1986) (considering subsequent affidavit as amending pro se complaint, on motion to dismiss) (citations omitted).

FN22. Cruz v. Gomez, 202 F.3d 593, 597 (2d

<u>Cir.2000</u>) (finding that plaintiff's conclusory allegations of a due process violation were insufficient) (internal quotation and citation omitted).

FN23. Cuoco v. Moritsugu, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir.2000) (internal quotation and citation omitted); see also Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a) (leave to amend "shall be freely given when justice so requires").

FN24. Yang v. New York City Trans. Auth., No. 01-CV-3933, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20223, 2002 WL 31399119, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Oct.24, 2002) (denying leave to amend where plaintiff had already amended complaint once); Advanced Marine Tech. v. Burnham Sec., Inc., 16 F.Supp.2d 375, 384 (S.D.N.Y.1998) (denying leave to amend where plaintiff had already amended complaint once).

FN25. Cuoco, 222 F.3d at 112 (finding that repleading would be futile) (citation omitted); see also Cortec Indus., Inc. v. Sum Holding L.P., 949 F.2d 42, 48 (2d Cir.1991) ("Of course, where a plaintiff is unable to allege any fact sufficient to support its claim, a complaint should be dismissed with prejudice.") (affirming, in part, dismissal of claim with prejudice) (citation omitted); see, e.g., See Rhodes v. Hoy, No. 05-CV-0836, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48370, 2007 WL 1343649, at *3, 7 (N.D.N.Y. May 5, 2007) (Scullin, J., adopting Report-Recommendation of Peebles, M.J.) (denying pro se plaintiff opportunity to amend before dismissing his complaint because the error in his complaint-the fact that plaintiff enjoyed no constitutional right of access to DOCS' established grievance process-was substantive and not formal in nature, rendering repleading futile); Thabault v. Sorrell, No. 07-CV-0166, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62919, 2008 WL 3582743, at *2 (D.Vt. Aug. 13, 2008) (denying pro se plaintiff opportunity to amend before

dismissing his complaint because the errors in his complaint-lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and lack of standing-were substantive and not formal in nature, rendering repleading futile) (citations omitted); Hylton v. All Island Cab Co., No. 05-CV-2355, 2005 WL 1541049, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. June 29, 2005) (denying pro se plaintiff opportunity to amend before dismissing his complaint arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because the errors in his complaint-which included the fact that plaintiff alleged no violation of either the Constitution or laws of the United States, but only negligence-were substantive and not formal in nature, rendering repleading futile); Sundwall v. Leuba, No. 00-CV-1309, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 737, 2001 WL 58834, at *11 (D.Conn. Jan.23, 2001) (denying pro se plaintiff opportunity to amend before dismissing his complaint arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because the error in his complaint-the fact that the defendants were protected from liability by Eleventh Amendment immunity-was substantive and not formal in nature, rendering repleading futile).

*9 However, while this special leniency may somewhat loosen the procedural rules governing the form of pleadings (as the Second Circuit has observed), FN26 it does not completely relieve a *pro se* plaintiff of the duty to satisfy the pleading standards set forth in Rules 8, 10 and 12. FN27 Rather, as both the Supreme Court and Second Circuit have repeatedly recognized, the requirements set forth in Rules 8, 10 and 12 are procedural rules that even *pro se* civil rights plaintiffs must follow. FN28 Stated more plainly, when a plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, "all normal rules of pleading are not absolutely suspended." FN29

FN26. Sealed Plaintiff v. Sealed Defendant # 1, No. 06-1590, 2008 U.S.App. LEXIS 17113, 2008 WL 3294864, at *5 (2d Cir. Aug.12, 2008) ("[The obligation to construe the pleadings of pro se litigants liberally] entails, at the very least, a permissive application of the rules governing the form of pleadings.") [internal quotation

marks and citation omitted]; see also <u>Traguth v. Zuck</u>, 710 F.2d 90, 95 (2d Cir.1983) ("[R]easonable allowances to protect *pro se* litigants from inadvertent forfeiture of important rights because of their lack of legal training ... should not be impaired by harsh application of technical rules.") (citation omitted).

FN27. See Prezzi v. Schelter, 469 F.2d 691, 692 (2d Cir.1972) (extra liberal pleading standard set forth in Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972), did not save pro se complaint from dismissal for failing to comply with Fed.R.Civ.P.8); accord, Shoemaker v. State of Cal., 101 F.3d 108 (2d Cir.1996) (citing Prezzi v. Schelter, 469 F.2d 691) (unpublished disposition cited only to acknowledge the continued precedential effect of Prezzi v. Schelter, 469 F.2d 691, within the Second Circuit); accord, Praseuth v. Werbe, 99 F.3d 402 (2d Cir.1995).

FN28. See McNeil v. U.S., 508 U.S. 106, 113, 113 S.Ct. 1980, 124 L.Ed.2d 21 (1993) ("While we have insisted that the pleadings prepared by prisoners who do not have access to counsel be liberally construed ... we have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel."); Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806, 834, n. 46, 95 S.Ct. 2525, 45 L.Ed.2d 562 (1975) ("The right of self-representation is not a license ... not to comply with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law."); Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons, 470 F.3d 471, 477 (2d Cir.2006) (pro se status "does not exempt a party from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law") (citation omitted); Traguth v. Zuck, 710 F.2d 90, 95 (2d Cir.1983) (pro se status "does not exempt a party from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law") (citation omitted); cf. Phillips v. Girdich, 408 F.3d 124, 128, 130 (2d Cir.2005)

(acknowledging that *pro se* plaintiffs complaint could be dismissed for failing to comply with Rules 8 and 10 if his mistakes either "undermine the purpose of notice pleading [] or prejudice the adverse party").

FN29. Stinson v. Sheriff's Dep't of Sullivan County., 499 F.Supp. 259, 262 & n. 9 (S.D.N.Y.1980).

III. ANALYSIS

A. Weissman/Richards Health Care

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Drs. Weissman and Richards violated his Eighth Amendment right to adequate medical care by prescribing an ineffective medication for his body itch, refusing to order an MRI of his left wrist and right ankle, and refusing to refer him to an orthopedist. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 12.) Defendants move for summary judgment of these claims, arguing that (1) Plaintiff did not suffer from a serious medical need; and (2) Defendants were not deliberately indifferent. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 13-14.)

1. Eighth Amendment Standard

The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits "cruel and unusual" punishments. The word "punishment" refers not only to deprivations imposed as a sanction for criminal wrongdoing, but also to deprivations suffered during imprisonment. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 102-03, 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976). Punishment is "cruel and unusual" if it involves the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain or if it is incompatible with "the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 102. Thus, the Eighth Amendment imposes on jail officials the duty to "provide humane conditions of confinement" for prisoners. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 832, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994). Thus, prison officials must "ensure that inmates receive adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, and must 'take reasonable measures to

guarantee the safety of the inmates.' " <u>Farmer</u>, 511 U.S. <u>at 832</u> (quoting <u>Hudson v. Palmer</u>, 468 U.S. 517, 526-27, 104 S.Ct. 3194, 82 L.Ed.2d 393 (1984)).

A viable Eighth Amendment claim must contain both an objective and a subjective component. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 834. To satisfy the objective component, "the deprivation alleged must be, objectively, 'sufficiently serious.' " Id. (quoting Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 298, 111 S.Ct. 2321, 115 L.Ed.2d 271 (1991)). Analyzing the objective element of an Eighth Amendment medical care claim requires two inquiries. "The first inquiry is whether the prisoner was actually deprived of adequate medical care." Salahuddin v. Goord, 467 F.3d 263, 279 (2d Cir.2006). The word "adequate" reflects the reality that "[p]rison officials are not obligated to provide inmates with whatever care the inmates desire. Rather, prison officials fulfill their obligations under the Eighth Amendment when the care provided is 'reasonable.' " Jones v. Westchester County Dept. of Corr. Med. Dept., 557 F.Supp.2d 408, 413 (S.D.N.Y.2008).

*10 The second inquiry is "whether the inadequacy in medical care is sufficiently serious. This inquiry requires the court to examine how the offending conduct is inadequate and what harm, if any, the inadequacy has caused or will likely cause the prisoner." Salahuddin, 467 F.3d at 280. The focus of the second inquiry depends on whether the prisoner claims to have been completely deprived of treatment or whether he claims to have received treatment that was inadequate. Id. If "the unreasonable medical care is a failure to provide any treatment for an inmate's medical condition, courts examine whether the inmate's medical condition is sufficiently serious." Id. A "serious medical need" is "a condition of urgency, one that may produce death, degeneration, or extreme pain." Nance v. Kelly, 912 F.2d 605, 607 (2d Cir.1990) (Pratt, J. dissenting) (citations omitted), accord, Hathaway v. Coughlin, 37 F.3d 63, 66 (2d Cir.1996), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 1154, 115 S.Ct. 1108, 130 L.Ed.2d 1074 (1995); Chance v. Armstrong, 143 F.3d 698, 702 (2d Cir.1998). Relevant factors to consider when determining whether an alleged medical condition is sufficiently serious include, but are not limited to: (1) the existence of an injury that a reasonable doctor

or patient would find important and worthy of comment or treatment; (2) the presence of a medical condition that significantly affects an individual's daily activities; and (3) the existence of chronic and substantial pain. *Chance*, 143 F.3d at 702-03.

If the claim is that treatment was provided that was inadequate, the second inquiry is narrower. <u>Salahuddin</u>, 467 F.3d at 280. For example, "[w]hen the basis for a prisoner's Eighth Amendment claim is a temporary delay or interruption in the provision of otherwise adequate medical treatment, it is appropriate to focus on the challenged *delay* or *interruption* in treatment rather than the prisoner's *underlying medical condition* alone in analyzing whether the alleged deprivation" is sufficiently serious. <u>Smith v. Carpenter</u>, 316 F.3d 178, 185 (2d Cir.2003).

To satisfy the subjective component of an Eighth Amendment medical care claim, the defendant's behavior must be "wanton." What is considered "wanton" must be determined with "due regard for differences in the kind of conduct against which an Eighth Amendment objection is raised." Whitley v. Albers, 475 U.S. 312, 320, 106 S.Ct. 1078, 89 L.Ed.2d 251 (1986). Where a prisoner claims that a defendant provided inadequate medical care, he must show that the defendant acted with "deliberate indifference." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 105; Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 302-03, 111 S.Ct. 2321, 115 L.Ed.2d 271 (1991).

Medical mistreatment rises to the level of deliberate indifference only when it "involves culpable recklessness, i.e., an act or a failure to act ... that evinces 'a conscious disregard of a substantial risk of serious harm.'" *Chance*, 143 F.3d at 703 (quoting *Hathaway v. Coughlin*, 99 F.3d 550, 553 (2d Cir.1996)). Thus, to establish deliberate indifference, an inmate must prove that (1) a prison medical care provider was aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that the inmate had a serious medical need; and (2) the medical care provider actually drew that inference. *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 837; *Chance*, 143 F.3d at 702-703. The inmate then must establish that the provider consciously and intentionally disregarded or

ignored that serious medical need. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 835; Ross v. Giambruno, 112 F.3d 505, at *2 (2d Cir.1997). An "inadvertent failure to provide adequate medical care" does not constitute "deliberate indifference." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 105-06. Moreover, "a complaint that a physician has been negligent in diagnosing or treating a medical condition does not state a valid claim ... under the Eighth Amendment." Id. Stated another way, "medical malpractice does not become a constitutional violation merely because the victim is a prisoner." Id.; Smith v. Carpenter, 316 F.3d 178, 184 (2d Cir.2003) ("Because the Eighth Amendment is not a vehicle for bringing medical malpractice claims, nor a substitute for state tort law, not every lapse in prison medical care will rise to the level of a constitutional violation."). However, malpractice that amounts to culpable recklessness constitutes deliberate indifference. Accordingly, "a physician may be deliberately indifferent if he or she consciously chooses an easier and less efficacious treatment plan." Chance, 143 F.3d at 703 (citation omitted). Medical decisions that are contrary to accepted medical standards may constitute deliberate indifference if "the doctor has based his judgment on something other than sound medical judgment." Stevens v. Goord, 535 F.Supp.2d 373, 385 (S.D.N.Y.2008) (citation omitted). For instance, a doctor may be deliberately indifferent if he opts for an easier and less efficacious treatment plan "not on the basis of [his or her] medical views, but because of monetary incentives." Chance, 143 F.3d at 704.

2. <u>Atara</u>x

*11 Plaintiff claims that Defendants Weissman and Richards violated his Eighth Amendment rights by refusing to prescribe Atarax. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 1, 12.) Defendants move for summary judgment, arguing that Plaintiff's claim regarding the Atarax medication fulfills neither the objective nor the subjective prong of a viable Eighth Amendment claim. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 13-14.)

Regarding the objective prong, the parties' briefs focus entirely on whether Plaintiff suffered from a serious medical need. FN30 Applying the analytical framework described above, I must first address whether Plaintiff was

actually deprived of adequate medical care. I find that there is a triable issue of fact that the refusal to prescribe Atarax constituted a denial of adequate or reasonable care. I base this finding on the fact that Defendant Dr. Richards twice requested approval to prescribe Atarax, noting that he had already tried treating Plaintiff with Hydroxyzine, Vistril, Allegra, and Zytrec "all of which worsened [Plaintiff's] condition." (Weissman Aff. Ex. A-9.)

FN30. Defendants argue that Plaintiff's severe body itch was not a serious medical need because it was not a "condition of urgency, one that may produce death, degeneration, or extreme pain". (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 13.) Plaintiff argues that severe body itch was a symptom of his Hepatitis C, which is a serious medical need. (Dkt. No. 109 at 28-30.)

Because Plaintiff alleges that he was provided with inadequate treatment, rather than completely deprived of treatment, the next inquiry is whether the *deprivation* was sufficiently serious. This requires an analysis of what harm, if any, the failure to prescribe <u>Atarax</u> caused or will cause Plaintiff. Here, there is simply no evidence before the Court that being deprived of <u>Atarax</u> harmed or threatened to harm Plaintiff. Rather, the evidence shows that Plaintiff suffered from a severe body itch. While this condition was undoubtedly unpleasant, it simply does not rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation. Therefore, I find that Plaintiff has not raised a triable issue of fact regarding the objective prong of his Eighth Amendment claim regarding Defendant Weissman and Richards' failure to prescribe <u>Atarax</u>.

Having found that there is not a triable issue of fact as to the objective prong, it is not necessary to analyze the subjective prong. However, I will briefly address the parties' contentions for the sake of completeness. Defendants argue that the refusal by Defendants Weissman and Richards to prescribe Atarax was not deliberate indifference because the decision of "which medicine to prescribe for a particular condition amount[s] to nothing more than a disagreement with the course of treatment-not deliberate indifference." (Dkt. No. 92-10 at

13-14.) Defendants' argument regarding deliberate indifference is based entirely on the affidavit of Dr. Weissman. FN31 Interestingly, in contrast to her statements regarding Plaintiff's orthopedic care (discussed below), Dr. Weissman does not state that the decision not to prescribe Atarax was based on her medical judgment. Rather, she states that Atarax is a "non-formulary" medication and "special approval must be obtained to issue that medication." (Weissman Aff. ¶ 4.) Dr. Weissman does not say who was authorized to approve the use of non-formulary drugs. Dr. Richards twice requested approval to prescribe Atarax to Plaintiff. (Weissman Aff. ¶¶ 7-8, Ex. A-9 and A-10.) In one of these requests, he stated that the other medications he had tried "worsened" Plaintiff's condition. (Weissman Aff. Ex. A-9.) His requests were denied. (Weissman Aff. ¶¶ 7-8, Ex. A-9 and A-10.) This sequence of events raises two interesting and related issues: does the acquiescence of Dr. Weissman and Dr. Richards to a course of treatment for Plaintiff with which they disagreed constitute deliberate indifference? FN32 Or does the fact that the decision not to prescribe Atarax was made by someone other than Dr. Weissman and Dr. Richards indicate that they were not personally involved with, and thus not liable for, the decision? See Johnson v. Wright, 412 F.3d 398 (2d Cir.2005) (claims against administrators who refused to approve treatment requested by treating physicians survived summary judgment; treating physicians were not named as defendants). The parties have not addressed these issues, and, due to my finding that there is no triable issue of fact as to the objective prong and in the absence of briefing, I decline to do so.

<u>FN31.</u> Dr. Richards did not file an affidavit supporting Defendants' motion for summary judgment.

FN32. See Sulton v. Wright, 265 F.Supp.2d 292 (S.D.N.Y.2003) (holding that a prisoner stated an Eighth Amendment claim against a doctor and physician's assistant who pursued less vigorous treatment than they had originally recommended when their request for approval of knee surgery was denied).

3. MRI and Orthopedic Referral

*12 Plaintiff claims that Defendants Weissman and Richards violated his Eighth Amendment rights by refusing to take MRIs of his left wrist and right ankle or to refer him to an orthopedist who could determine if medical footwear was necessary to correct his right foot problem. (Dkt. No. 1¶12.) Defendants argue that (1) any deprivation was not sufficiently serious to trigger Eighth Amendment scrutiny; and (2) they were not deliberately indifferent. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 13-14.) Defendants are correct.

Even if one assumes that the deprivation was sufficiently serious to trigger Eighth Amendment scrutiny, the evidence does not raise a triable issue of fact that Defendants were deliberately indifferent. Regarding the MRIs, Dr. Weissman declares that "Dr. Richards and I felt, in our medical judgment, an MRI was not warranted." Because Plaintiff's "pain and numbness was improving with time, Dr. Richards requested, and I approved, physical therapy for [P]laintiff beginning in January 2003." (Weissman Aff. ¶ 11.) In September 2003, Dr. Richards referred Plaintiff to an orthopedist for treatment of his left wrist because, after completing physical therapy, Plaintiff was "still having [a] considerable amount of pain." (Weissman Aff. Ex. A-13.) The orthopedist examined Plaintiff and reported that Plaintiff "seems to be improving at this point and unfortunately, there is not much else I can suggest for Henry to improve or accelerate his healing." (Weissman Aff. Ex. A-14.)

Plaintiff filed a grievance a year after seeing the orthopedist complaining that Dr. Richards and Dr. Weissman "willfully refused to examine my injuries, to provide medical treatment for said injuries, and to order an MRI test of said injuries conducted ... in an attempt to prevent me from proving the precise nature and extent of my injuries in a court of law and, thus, to dissuade me from suing." (P.'s Decl. in Opp'n to Aff. of Evelyn Weissman, Ex. D.) Plaintiff argues that this grievance proves that he "continued to complain to these defendants about continuing severe pain in his left wrist and right ankle for more than one year after he had been evaluated

by the orthopedist." (Dkt. No. 109 at 24-25.) The grievance Plaintiff cites does not mention any "continuing severe pain in his left wrist and right ankle." Therefore, I recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claims against Defendants Weissman and Richards. FN33

FN33. Plaintiff's complaint also asserts a retaliation claim against Defendants Weissman and Richards on these facts. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 12.) Defendants have not addressed this claim. I find that it is subject to *sua sponte* dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (2)(B) because the evidence does not establish that Defendants took adverse action. While the denial of medical care may establish adverse action, *see e.g. Odom v. Poirier*, No. 99 Civ. 4933, 2004 WL 2884409, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Dec.10, 2004), I have found that Defendants Weissman and Richards did not deny Plaintiff medical care. Therefore, I recommend that the Court dismiss this claim.

B. Ham/Grievances

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Ham violated his Eighth Amendment rights by refusing to loosen or remove his restraints on November 7 and 14, 2002. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 9-10.) He further alleges that Defendants Brousseau and Donelli violated his constitutional rights by refusing to forward his grievance regarding Defendant Ham for an investigation. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 28-29.) Defendants argue that (1) Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding his claims against Defendant Ham; (2) Plaintiff's allegations are not "sufficiently serious" to implicate the Eighth Amendment; and (3) Plaintiff's allegations regarding the handling of his grievance do not raise a constitutional claim. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 21-23, 38.)

*13 Defendants argue that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding his claims against

1. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Defendant Ham. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 21-23.) I find that there is a triable issue of fact that Plaintiff's failure to

receive a final decision on the merits of his grievance regarding Defendant Ham was justified.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA") requires that prisoners who bring suit in federal court must first exhaust their available administrative remedies: "No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under § 1983 ... by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted." FN34 "[T]he PLRA's exhaustion requirement applies to all inmate suits about prison life, whether they involve general circumstances or particular episodes, and whether they allege excessive force or some other wrong." FN35 The Department of Correctional Services ("DOCS") has available a well-established three-step inmate grievance program. FN36

FN34. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e.

FN35. Porter v. Nussle, 534 U.S. 516, 532, 122 S.Ct. 983, 152 L.Ed.2d 12 (2002).

FN36. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.7.

Generally, the DOCS Inmate Grievance Program ("IGP") involves the following procedure for the filing of grievances. First, an inmate must file a complaint with the facility's IGP clerk within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the alleged occurrence. If a grievance complaint form is not readily available, a complaint may be submitted on plain paper. A representative of the facility's inmate grievance resolution committee ("IGRC") has sixteen (16) calendar days from receipt of the grievance to informally resolve the issue. If there is no such informal resolution, then the full IGRC conducts a hearing within sixteen (16) calendar days of receipt of the grievance, and issues a written decision within two (2) working days of the conclusion of the hearing. Second, a grievant may appeal the IGRC decision to the facility's superintendent within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of the IGRC's written decision. The superintendent is to issue a written decision within twenty (20) calendar days of receipt of the grievant's appeal. Third, a grievant may appeal to the central office review committee ("CORC") within seven

(7) working days of receipt of the superintendent's written decision. CORC is to render a written decision within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the appeal. It is important to note that any failure by the IGRC or the superintendent to timely respond to a grievance or first-level appeal, respectively, can be appealed to the next level, including CORC, to complete the grievance process. FN38 If a prisoner has failed to properly follow each of the applicable steps prior to commencing litigation, he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 126 S.Ct. 2378, 165 L.Ed.2d 368 (2006).

FN37. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. §§ 701.5, 701.6(g), 701.7; see also White v. The State of New York, No. 00-CV-3434, 2002 WL 31235713, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Oct.3, 2002).

FN38. 7 N.Y.C.R.R. § 701.6(g) ("[M]atters not decided within the time limits may be appealed to the next step."); <u>Hemphill v. New York</u>, 198 F.Supp.2d 546, 549 (S.D.N.Y.2002), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 380 F.3d 680 (2d Cir.2004); see, e.g., Croswell v. McCoy, 01-CV-0547, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3442, at *12, 2003 WL 962534, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. March 11, 2003) (Sharpe, M.J.) ("If a plaintiff receives no response to a grievance and then fails to appeal it to the next level, he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies as required by the PLRA."); Reves v. Punzal, 206 F.Supp.2d 431, 433 (W.D.N.Y.2002) ("Even assuming that plaintiff never received a response to his grievance, he had further administrative avenues of relief open to him."); Nimmons v. Silver, 03-CV-0671, Report-Recommendation, at 15-16 (N.D.N.Y. filed Aug. 29, 2006) (Lowe, M.J.) (recommending that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment, in part because plaintiff adduced no evidence that he appealed the lack of a timely decision by the facility's IGRC to the next level, namely to either the facility's superintendent or CORC), adopted by Decision and Order (N.D.N.Y. filed Oct. 17,

2006) (Hurd, J.).

Here, Plaintiff declares that on the day of the first incident with Defendant Ham, he asked a Five Points Correctional Facility officer for a grievance form. (P.'s Decl. in Opp'n to Aff. of Karen Bellamy ¶ 17.) The officer did not give Plaintiff a form and told Plaintiff that he would need to file his grievance at Elmira Correctional Facility, where the incident had occurred. Id. Although an April 16, 2004, revision to the inmate grievance procedure specified that grievances "may only be filed at the facility where the inmate is housed even if it pertains to another facility," (Id., at Ex. A), the procedures in effect at the time Plaintiff asked for a form to file a complaint against Defendant Ham were silent as to which facility should handle a particular grievance. Even if one assumes that the Five Points officer's advice was correct under DOCS practice at the time, it is difficult to see how Plaintiff could have filed a grievance at Elmira. Plaintiff was only at Elmira Correctional Facility for a few hours after receiving these instructions from the officer, during which time he was handcuffed and shackled. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 10.)

*14 On December 8, 2002, Plaintiff filed a grievance at Upstate Correctional Facility regarding Defendant Ham's actions. (Dkt. No. 92-4, Ex. 4.) Defendant Brousseau, the IGP supervisor, returned the grievance to Plaintiff because Plaintiff failed to submit it within fourteen days of the incident. FN39 Id.

<u>FN39</u>. The inmate grievance procedures in place at the time of the incident required inmates to file grievances within 14, rather than 21, days.

On December 18, 2002, Plaintiff submitted a grievance complaining that Defendant Brousseau's refusal to accept the previous grievance violated his constitutional right of access to the courts because it prevented him from exhausting his claims against Defendant Ham. (Dkt. No. 92-4, Ex. 4.) The IGRC denied Plaintiff's grievance on December 26, 2002. *Id.* The IGRC stated that Defendant Brousseau's refusal was proper because Plaintiff "did not present any mitigating circumstances that would warrant accepting the [untimely] complaint ... [Plaintiff] had been

back at the facility since 11/15/02 and had filed one grievance during this time period, this shows he had ample opportunity to file this complaint in a timely manner." *Id.* The grievance to which the IGRC's decision referred was a grievance regarding Defendant Richards' denial of Atarax. (Dkt. No. 92-4, Ex. 3.) Because that event occurred at Upstate Correctional Facility, there was no ambiguity about where Plaintiff's grievance should be filed.

Plaintiff appealed the IGRC's determination to the Superintendent. (Dkt. No. 92-4, Ex. 4.) Defendant Donelli affirmed the IGRC's determination on January 15, 2003. *Id*

Defendants assert that Plaintiff "did not appeal [Defendant Donelli's decision] to the CORC." (Dkt. No. 92-3, Stmt. Pursuant to Rule 7.1(a)(3) ¶ 8.) For this proposition, they cite Exhibit 4 and to the Affidavit of Karen Bellamy. Id. Exhibit 4 shows that Plaintiff signed an "Appeal Statement" stating that he wished to appeal Defendant Donelli's decision to CORC. (Dkt. No. 92-4, Ex. 4.) The Appeal Statement was signed by a grievance clerk. Id. That exhibit also shows that Defendant Brousseau responded to an inquiry regarding the status of the grievance by stating that the grievance had been received by CORC and was being processed. Id. However, the record before the Court does include any final disposition from CORC of Plaintiff's appeal. The appeal does not appear in a list provided in the Affidavit of Karen Bellamy of grievances on which Plaintiff received a final decision from CORC. (Bellamy Aff. Ex. B.) Thus, Plaintiff never received a decision from CORC and did not exhaust his administrative remedies. See Mendez v. Artuz, No. 01 CIV. 4157, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3263, at * 4, 2002 WL 313796, at * 2 (S.D.N.Y. Feb.27, 2002). Even if CORC had acted on Plaintiff's appeal, I assume that CORC would have upheld the IGRC's finding and denied Plaintiff's grievance as untimely. In that event, I would find that Plaintiff had not exhausted his administrative remedies because "courts consistently have found that CORC's dismissal of a grievance appeal as untimely constitutes failure to exhaust available administrative remedies." Soto v. Belcher, 339 F.Supp.2d 592, 595

(S.D.N.Y.2004).

*15 Plaintiff's failure to exhaust, however, does not end the inquiry. The Second Circuit has held that a three-part inquiry is appropriate where a prisoner has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. First, "the court must ask whether [the] administrative remedies [not pursued by the prisoner] were in fact 'available' to the prisoner." FN41 Second, if those remedies were available, "the court should ... inquire as to whether [some or all of] the defendants may have forfeited the affirmative defense of non-exhaustion by failing to raise or preserve it ... or whether the defendants' own actions inhibiting the [prisoner's] exhaustion of remedies may estop one or more of the defendants from raising the plaintiff's failure to exhaust as a defense." FN42 Third, if the remedies were available and some of the defendants did not forfeit, and were not estopped from raising, the non-exhaustion defense, "the Court should consider whether 'special circumstances' have been plausibly alleged that justify the prisoner's failure to comply with the administrative procedural requirements." FN43 Justification "must be determined by looking at the circumstances which might understandably lead ... uncounselled prisoners to fail to grieve in the normally required way." Giano v. Good, 380 F.3d 670, 678 (2d Cir.2004). Here, the silence of the regulations regarding which facility was the proper venue for Plaintiff's grievance, the bad advice that Plaintiff received from the officer at Five Points, and Plaintiff's inability to follow that advice because he was shackled during his entire tenure at Elmira create a triable issue of fact that Plaintiff's failure to file a timely grievance regarding Defendant Ham's actions was justified. I therefore find that summary judgment is not appropriate on the grounds that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies.

FN40. See Hemphill v. State of New York, 380 F.3d 680, 686, 691 (2d Cir.2004). The Second Circuit has not yet decided whether the Hemphill rule has survived the Supreme Court's decision in Woodford. Chavis v. Goord, No. 07-4787-pr, 2009 U.S.App. LEXIS 13681, 2009 WL 1803454, at *1 (2d Cir. June 25, 2009).

FN41. <u>Hemphill</u>, 380 F.3d at 686 (citation omitted).

FN42. Id. (citations omitted).

<u>FN43.</u> *Id.* (citations and internal quotations omitted).

2. "Sufficiently Serious"

Defendants argue that there is not a triable issue of material fact regarding Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim against Defendant Ham because "Plaintiff's alleged 'enormous pain' is nothing more than *de minimis* for Constitutional purposes." (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 22-23.)

Claims that prison officials applied restraints too tightly are analyzed under the Eighth Amendment as claims of excessive force. See <u>Davidson v. Flynn</u>, 32 F.3d 27 (2d Cir.1994). When prison officials are "accused of using excessive physical force in violation of the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause, the core judicial inquiry is ... whether force was applied in a good-faith effort to maintain or restore discipline, or maliciously and sadistically to cause harm." Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 6-7, 112 S.Ct. 995, 117 L.Ed.2d 156 (1992). The extent of any injury suffered by the inmate "is one factor that may suggest whether the use of force could plausibly have been thought necessary in a particular situation or instead evinced such wantoness with respect to the unjustified infliction of harm as is tantamount to a knowing willingness that it occur." Id. at 7 (citation and quotation marks omitted).

*16 In determining whether the use of force was wanton and unnecessary, it may also be proper to evaluate the need for application of force, the relationship between that need and the amount of force used, the threat reasonably perceived by responsible officials, and any efforts made to temper the severity of a forceful response. The absence of serious injury is therefore relevant to the Eighth Amendment inquiry, but does not end it.

Id. (citation and quotation marks omitted). In other words, not "every malevolent touch by a prison guard gives rise to a federal cause of action. The Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and usual punishments necessarily excludes from constitutional recognition de minimis uses of physical force, provided that the use of force is not of a sort repugnant to the conscience of mankind." Id. at 9 (officers who punched and kicked handcuffed and shackled inmate used unconstitutional force although inmate required no medical attention) (citations omitted); *Davidson*, 32 F.3d at 30 n. 1 (officers who placed handcuffs too tightly on inmate in retaliation for filing lawsuits used unconstitutional force where inmate suffered permanent scarring and numbness); compare Warren v. Purcell, No. 03 Civ. 8736, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17792, at *24, 2004 WL 1970642 (S.D.N.Y. Sept.3, 2004) (officers who placed prisoner in tight restraints did not violate constitution where prisoner suffered temporary pain, numbness and swelling and no improper or wanton motive was suggested for the officers' actions). FN44

<u>FN44.</u> Defendants served this unpublished case on Plaintiff with their moving papers as required by Local Rule 7.1(a)(1). (Dkt. No. 92-11.)

Plaintiff does not allege that he was permanently injured as a result of Defendant Ham's actions. Plaintiff states that he suffered "enormous pain" and "severe swelling" as a result of being shackled so tightly. (Dkt. No. 109 at 38.) Although this would not end the Eighth Amendment inquiry if Defendant Ham's actions had been more egregious, there is simply no evidence in the record that Defendant Ham applied restraints to Plaintiff "maliciously and sadistically to cause harm" or in a way that was "repugnant to the conscience of mankind." Therefore, I recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion and dismiss Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Ham.

3. Grievances

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Brousseau and Donelli "refused to forward" his complaint regarding

Defendant Ham's actions "for an investigation" (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 28-29), thus violating his First Amendment right to petition the government. (Dkt. No. 109 at 50-51.) Defendants argue that Plaintiff's allegation fails to state a constitutional violation. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 38.) Defendants are correct.

The First Amendment protects a prisoner's right to meaningful access to the courts and to petition the government for the redress of grievances. See Bill Johnson's Rest., Inc. v. NLRB, 461 U.S. 731, 741, 103 S.Ct. 2161, 76 L.Ed.2d 277 (1983). However, inmate grievance programs created by state law are not required by the Constitution and consequently allegations that prison officials violated those procedures does not give rise to a cognizable § 1983 claim. Cancel v. Goord, No. 00 Civ.2042, 2001 WL 303713, *3 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2001). If prison officials ignore a grievance that raises constitutional claims, an inmate can directly petition the government for redress of that claim. See Flick v. Alba, 932 F.2d 728, 729 (8th Cir. 1991). "Therefore, the refusal to process an inmate's grievance or failure to see to it that grievances are properly processed does not create a claim under § 1983." Cancel, 2001 WL 303713, at *3; see also Torres v. Mazzuca, 246 F.Supp.2d 334, 342 (S.D.N.Y.2003); Mahotep v. DeLuca, 3 F.Supp.2d 385, 390 (W.D.N.Y.1998).

*17 Shell v. Brzezniak, 365 F.Supp.2d 362, 369-370 (W.D.N.Y.2005). Therefore, I recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss the claims against Defendants Brousseau and Donelli for their handling of Plaintiff's grievance regarding Defendant Ham.

C. Frisk Room Incident/Aftermath/Grievances

Plaintiff alleges that he threatened to sue Defendants Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder if they used force to put on his coat. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 15.) Plaintiff alleges that, in retaliation for this threat, (1) Defendant Wright conspired with Defendant Snyder to subject Plaintiff to excessive force; (2) Defendants Duprat, Snyder, and Bogett used excessive force on Plaintiff; (3) Defendants Wright,

Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder falsified misbehavior reports against Plaintiff; and (4) Defendant Bezio failed to intervene to prevent the use of excessive force. FN45 (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 16-22.) He further alleges that Defendants Brousseau and Donelli would not allow Plaintiff to file a grievance regarding these events. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 30-31.) Finally, he alleges that Defendants Girdich and Eagen denied the grievance he filed regarding Defendant Brousseau and Donelli's refusal to process Plaintiff's grievance. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 32-34.)

FN45. The complaint contains some language that could, very liberally construed, assert a claim against these Defendants for denial of Plaintiff's right of access to the courts on the theory that, at the time of these events, Plaintiff was being transported for a court appearance. Defendants addressed this possible claim in their motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 40-42.) In his opposition to the motion, Plaintiff states that he did not intend to assert a claim for denial of access to the courts. (Dkt. No. 109 at 55.) I have therefore not addressed Defendants' arguments.

1. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Defendants argue that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding any of these claims. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 25-26, 31.) Plaintiff declares that on January 13, 2003, he attempted to submit a grievance to Defendant Brousseau regarding the claims. (P.'s Decl. in Opp'n to Aff. of Karen Bellamy ¶ 26.) Plaintiff declares that Defendant Brousseau "refused to file and process the grievance ... in order to prevent me from suing the officials named in the grievance." *Id.* ¶ 27.

On April 3, 2003, Plaintiff submitted a grievance complaining that Defendant Brousseau had refused to accept his January 13 grievance. (Dkt. No. 92-4, Ex. 8.) Plaintiff requested "[t]hat Ms. Brousseau submit the grievance complaint in question to the IGRC. Alternatively, that I be allowed to resubmit a copy of the grievance complaint in issue to the IGRC before moving for judicial intervention." *Id.* CORC denied the grievance on May 28, 2003, stating that it had "not been presented

with sufficient evidence to substantiate any malfeasance" by Defendant Brousseau. *Id*.

As discussed above, Second Circuit precedent holds that a defendant may be equitably estopped from raising the exhaustion defense if he or she engaged in conduct that hindered the plaintiff's ability to pursue his or her administrative remedies. Ziemba v. Wezner, 366 F.3d 161, 163-64 (2d Cir.2004). A prison official's refusal to accept or forward a prisoner's grievance is conduct that hinders a plaintiff's ability to pursue administrative remedies. Sandlin v. Poole, 575 F.Supp.2d 484, (W.D.N.Y.2008). Thus, Plaintiff's declaration that Defendant Brousseau refused to accept his grievance raises a triable issue of fact that Defendants are estopped from asserting the exhaustion defense. Therefore, I recommend that the Court reject Defendants' argument that they are entitled to summary judgment as a result of Plaintiff's failure to exhaust his administrative remedies.

2. Conspiracy

*18 Defendants move for summary judgment of Plaintiff's conspiracy claim. FN46 They argue that (a) Plaintiff has not shown that there was any meeting of the minds; and (b) the claim is barred by the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine. FN47 (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 31-32.)

FN46. Defendants characterize Defendants Wright and Snyder as the only defendants to the conspiracy claim. Read broadly, the complaint also alleges that Defendant Duprat conspired with Defendants Wright and Snyder by calling Snyder "to arrange a beating" of Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 21.) I will include Defendant Duprat in my analysis of Plaintiff's conspiracy claim.

FN47. Defendants also argue that to the extent Plaintiff's conspiracy claim is brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1985, he has not shown that Defendants were motivated by any class-based animus. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 31-32.) In his opposition to Defendants' motion, Plaintiff states that he did not intend to raise a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1985. (Dkt. No. 109 at 44 n. 15.) Therefore, I

have not addressed Defendants' argument regarding class-based animus.

a. Meeting of the Minds

Defendants argue that Plaintiff has not provided any factual basis for a finding that Defendants had a "meeting of the minds" as required for a conspiracy claim. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 31-32.) I find that Plaintiff has raised a triable issue of fact.

"To prove a § 1983 conspiracy, a plaintiff must show: (1) an agreement between two or more state actors or between a state actor and a private entity; (2) to act in concert to inflict an unconstitutional injury; and (3) an overt act done in furtherance of that goal causing damages." *Pangburn v. Culbertson*, 200 F.3d 65, 72 (2d Cir.1999) (citations omitted).

Plaintiff has raised a genuine issue of material fact as to all of the elements of his § 1983 conspiracy claim. Plaintiff states in his verified complaint that Defendant Wright told him that "'[t]ransportation vans don't have cameras. You're going to learn not to spit ... [at] staff and not threaten us with lawsuits.' " (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 16.) The next day, Defendant Duprat called Defendant Snyder "to arrange a beating" of Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 21.) Defendant Snyder entered the transportation van in which Plaintiff was sitting, said "Wright, my boss, doesn't like [you suing us] and sent this as a reminder," and then punched and slapped Plaintiff until Plaintiff lost consciousness. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 21-22.) A reasonable jury could, if it found Plaintiff's testimony credible, return a verdict for Plaintiff on his conspiracy claim based on this evidence.

b. Intracorporate Conspiracy Doctrine

Defendants argue that Plaintiff's conspiracy claim is barred by the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 32.) Under that doctrine, employees of a single corporate entity are legally incapable of conspiring together. Bond v. Board of Educ. of City of New York, 97-cv-1337, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3164, at *5, 1999 WL 151702, at *2 (W.D.N.Y. Mar.17, 1999). "This doctrine

applies to public entities and their employees." Lee v. City of Syracuse, 603 F.Supp.2d 417, 442 (N.D.N.Y.2009) (citations omitted). Although the Second Circuit has recognized the doctrine in the context of 42 U.S.C. § 1985, see Herrmann v. Moore, 576 F.2d 453, 459 (2d Cir.1978); Girard v. 94th and Fifth Avenue Corp., 530 F.2d 66, 72 (2d Cir.1976), it has not extended its application of the doctrine to conspiracy claims under § 1983. Several district courts in the Second Circuit have, however, applied the doctrine to § 1983 cases. FN48 The district court cases cited in the footnote applied the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine to § 1983 without discussing whether it was appropriate to do so. In Anemone v. Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 419 F.Supp.2d 602, 604 (S.D.N.Y.2006), the Southern District squarely held that the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine should be applied to § 1983 cases because "the doctrine's logic is sound" and not "a single case within the Second Circuit [has] held the doctrine inapplicable to Section 1983 claims." I will assume that the doctrine applies in § 1983 cases.

> FN48. See Green v. Greene, No. 9:07-CV-0351 (GTS/DEP), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68186, 2009 WL 2424353 (N.D.N.Y. Aug.5, 2009); Sebast v. Mahan, No. 09-cv-98 (GLS/RFT), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 64712, 2009 WL 2256949, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. July 28, 2009); Lee v. City of Syracuse, 603 F.Supp.2d 417 (N.D.N.Y.2009); Lukowski v. County of Seneca, No. 08-CV6098, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14282, 2009 WL 467075 (W.D.N.Y. Feb.24, 2009); Perrin v. Canandaigua City School Dist., No. 08-CV-61536, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95280, 2008 WL 5054241 (W.D.N.Y. Nov.21, 2008); Rodriguez v. City of New York, --- F.Supp.2d ----, No. 05-CV-5117, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9966, 2008 WL 420015 (E.D.N.Y. Feb.11, 2008); Crews v. County of Nassau, No. 06-CV-2610, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38354, 2007 WL 4591325 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 27, 2007); Little v. City of New York, 487 F.Supp.2d 426 (S.D.N.Y.2007); Clark v. City of Oswego, No. 5:03-CV-202 (NAM/DEP), 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95769, 2007 WL 925724 (N.D.N.Y.

March 26, 2007); Malone v. City of New York, No. CV-05-2882, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61866, 2006 WL 2524197 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 30, 2006); Caidor v. M & T Bank, No. 5:05-CV-297 (FJS/GJD), 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22980, 2006 WL 839547 (N.D.N.Y. Mar.27, 2006).

*19 Even where the intracorporate conspiracy doctrine applies, there is an exception to the doctrine where "individuals pursue personal interests wholly separate and apart from the entity." Orafan v. Goord, 411 F.Supp.2d 153, 165 (N.D.N.Y.2006) (citation and quotation marks omitted), vacated and remanded on other grounds, Orafan v. Rashid, No. 06-2951, 249 Fed. Appx. 217 (2d Cir. Sept.28, 2007). I have previously found that a triable issue of fact exists regarding whether officers acted pursuant to their personal interests where a prisoner alleges that officers assaulted him in retaliation for participating in a federal lawsuit. Medina v. Hunt, No. 9:05-CV-1460, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 74205, 2008 WL 4426748 (N.D.N.Y. Sept.25, 2008). Other courts have found that the personal interest exception applies, and thus allowed conspiracy claims to proceed, where it was alleged that officers conspired to cover up their use of excessive force. Hill v. City of New York, No.03 CV 1283, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38926, 2005 WL 3591719, at *6 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 30, 2005). I find that the exception applies here because, as in Medina, Defendants allegedly conspired to retaliate against Plaintiff for his exercise of his right to access the courts. Therefore, I recommend that the Court deny Defendants' motion for summary judgment of the conspiracy claim against Defendants Wright, Snyder, and Duprat.

3. Excessive Force

Defendants move for summary judgment of Plaintiff's excessive force claims. They argue that there is no "objective evidence" that any excessive force was used. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 33-35.) Specifically, Defendants argue that:

[P]laintiff alleges that ... [D]efendants Snyder, Bogett, and Duprat punched him, slapped him, knocked him unconscious, and caused his ear to bleed. There is no

objective evidence to support this conclusory allegation. An unusual incident report was generated because of [P] laintiff's behavior on January 3, 2003, but the report specifically states that no force was used on [P]laintiff. To the extent [P]laintiff is claiming the alleged force was used in the van, after the incidents described in the unusual incident report, there is no objective evidence to support this conclusion either. Plaintiff's medical records for January 3, 2003, upon arrival at Five Points C.F. indicate "arrived via van with cuffs & chains and spit net-complains of pain and itching," that [P]laintiff was escorted to 12 building, and that [P]laintiff was given Naprosyn and Benadryl. There is no indication of bleeding, or that [P]laintiff reported being assaulted in the January 3, 2003 entry, or the entries for January 4, 5, and 6, 2003. Plaintiff does report being "knocked-out and beaten everywhere" on January 7, 2003, while still at Five Points C.F., but without any record of reporting this type of conduct for the four (4) days prior to January 7, 2003, it is not credible that the incident to which [P]laintiff is referring occurred on January 3, 2003. Moreover, the January 7, 2003, entry does not indicate whether [P]laintiff was claiming to have been "knocked out and beaten everywhere" by staff or other inmates. Plaintiff has no objective evidence to support his claim of excessive force.

*20 (Id. at 34-35, citations omitted.)

Defendants refer to Plaintiff's allegations as "conclusory." "Conclusory" means to "express[] a factual inference without stating the underlying facts on which the inference is based." *Black's Law Dictionary* 284 (7th ed.1999). Plaintiff's allegations are not conclusory. Rather, Plaintiff describes the incident in detail. The ultimate determination of whether or not Defendants used excessive force, then, will rest largely on the finder of fact's judgment regarding Plaintiff's credibility.

Defendants, naturally, do not find Plaintiff credible. In general, of course, "[c]redibility determinations ... are jury functions, not those of a judge." <u>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</u>, 477 U.S. 242, 255, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986). See also <u>Rule v. Brine, Inc.</u>, 85 F.3d

1002, 1011 (2d Cir. 1996) ("Assessments of credibility and choices between conflicting versions of the events are matters for the jury, not for the court on summary judgment."). Although Defendants do not explicitly say so, their argument that "Plaintiff has no objective evidence" is apparently an attempt to invoke a "narrow exception" to the general rule that credibility determinations are not to be made on summary judgment. Jeffreys v. City of New York, 426 F.3d 549, 554 (2d Cir.2005); Blake v. Race, 487 F.Supp.2d 187, 202 (E.D.N.Y.2007). In Jeffreys, the Second Circuit held that in the "rare circumstance where the plaintiff relies almost exclusively on his own testimony, much of which is contradictory and incomplete," the court may appropriately conclude at the summary judgment stage that no reasonable jury would credit the plaintiff's testimony. Jeffreys, 426 F.3d at 554.

The narrow holding of *Jeffreys* is not applicable here for three reasons. First, in order for the Jeffreys exception to apply, the plaintiff must rely "almost exclusively on his own testimony." Jeffreys, 426 F.3d at 554. Here, Plaintiff is not relying "almost exclusively on his own testimony." Rather, because of Defendants' conduct during discovery, Plaintiff is relying on his own testimony plus adverse inferences drawn in his favor. As a consequence of Defendants' conduct during discovery, I ordered that Plaintiff could "ask the Court to draw factual inferences favorable to him based upon the missing photographs of January 3 and 10, 2003." (Dkt. No. 107 at 2.) Plaintiff requests that the Court draw the following inference in his favor: "That were the Defendants to provide the Court with the missing photographs taken of [Plaintiff] at Five Points C.F. on January 3, 2003, such photographs would reveal that [Plaintiff] had bruises and lacerations on his face, right ear, and chest." (Dkt. No. 109 at 46-47 n. 15.) The Court grants Plaintiff's request and draws the inference in his favor.

Second, in order for the *Jeffreys* exception to apply, Plaintiff's testimony must be "contradictory or incomplete." *Jeffreys*, 426 F.3d at 554. Here, Plaintiff's testimony is neither contradictory nor incomplete. In *Jeffreys*, the plaintiff, who alleged that police officers had

beaten and defenestrated him, confessed on at least three occasions that he had jumped out of a third-story window rather than having been thrown. Id. at 552. The plaintiff did not publicly state that he had been thrown out of a window by police officers until nine months after the incident. Id. The plaintiff could not identify any of the individuals whom he alleged participated in the attack or describe their ethnicities, physical features, facial hair, weight, or clothing on the night in question. Id. Here, in contrast, Plaintiff has never given a contradictory account of the events in the transportation van on January 3, 2003. Although Defendants stress that Plaintiff's medical records do not show that Plaintiff reported the incident upon arrival at Five Points, Plaintiff states in his verified complaint that he informed Defendant Hensel on the day of the incident that he had been beaten by Upstate guards. He further alleges that Defendant Hensel made no record of his complaint. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 23.) Plaintiff's claim regarding Nurse Hensel is corroborated by the log book entry that shows that he was taken to see Nurse Hensel on January 3, 2003, and the fact that Defendants did not provide the Court with a medical record of that visit with Plaintiff's other Five Points Medical Records. (Defs.' Resp. to P's 1st Req. for Produc. of Docs., Ex. E at 11; Bannister Aff.) As Defendants admit, Plaintiff's medical records show that within four days of the incident he reported that he had been "knocked-out and beaten everywhere." (Bannister Aff. ¶ 10.) In addition, unlike in Jeffreys, Plaintiff has specifically identified the officers whom he alleges beat him.

*21 Third, the *Jeffreys* exception is most applicable where the plaintiff's version of events is contradicted by defense testimony. In *Jeffreys*, for instance, one of the arresting officers declared that, contrary to the plaintiff's version of events, he was the only officer who entered the room where the plaintiff was allegedly beaten and that he saw the plaintiff jump out the open window. *Jeffreys*, 426 F.3d at 551-52. Here, Plaintiff's version of events has not been contradicted by an affidavit from any of the officers whom he alleges used excessive force because Defendants' motion for summary judgment is not supported by any affidavit from Defendants Snyder, Duprat, or Bogett. The only proof offered by Defendants that they did *not* use

excessive force is a notation on a January 3, 2003, unusual incident report stating "Use of Force: No." (Dkt. No. 92-5, Ex. 16.)

Accordingly, I find that Plaintiff has presented sufficient "objective evidence" to raise a triable issue of fact that Defendants Snyder, Duprat, and Bogett subjected him to excessive force. FN49 I therefore recommend that the Court deny Defendants' motion for summary judgment of this claim.

FN49. Read broadly, the complaint also asserts an excessive force claim against Wright and retaliation claims against Defendants Snyder, Duprat, Bogett, and Wright. Defendants have not addressed these potential claims. I find that the claims are sufficient to withstand *sua sponte* review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

4. False Misbehavior Reports

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Nephew, Desotelle, Snyder, and Wright filed false misbehavior reports against him "in retaliation for his having threatened to sue them." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 17-18.) Defendants argue that (a) Plaintiff forfeited his claim by refusing to attend the disciplinary hearing on the charges; and (b) they would have issued the misbehavior reports regardless of any alleged retaliatory motive. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 25-29.)

a. Forfeiture

Defendants argue that Plaintiff "cannot establish a prima facie case of retaliation, because although he claims the misbehavior report[s were] 'falsified,' he has forfeited his opportunity to present any evidence calling into question the truth of the misbehavior report[s] by refusing to attend the disciplinary hearing." (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 26.) Defendants cite Brewer v. Kamas, 533 F.Supp.2d 318 (W.D.N.Y.2008). In order to analyze *Brewer*, a review of Second Circuit precedent governing prisoners' allegations regarding false misbehavior reports is required.

A prisoner's claim that a correctional officer filed a false misbehavior report may implicate two separate constitutional provisions: (a) the Fourteenth Amendment

right to procedural due process; or (b) the right not to be retaliated against for exercising First Amendment rights such as the right of access to the courts or the right to petition the government for redress of grievances.

In the procedural due process context, the Second Circuit has held that while a prisoner "has no constitutionally guaranteed immunity from being falsely or wrongly accused of conduct which may result in the deprivation of a protected liberty interest," he does have "the right not to be deprived of a protected liberty interest without due process of law." Freeman v. Rideout, 808 F.2d 949, 951 (2d Cir.1986). Where a prisoner is falsely accused of violating disciplinary rules, and a hearing is held on the allegedly false charges that comports with the procedural due process standards set forth by the Supreme Court in Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 41 L.Ed.2d 935 (1974), and any resulting guilty finding is based on "some evidence," the correctional officer's filing of unfounded charges does not give rise to procedural due process liability. Freeman, 808 F.2d at 953-54.

*22 Two years after its Freeman opinion, the Second Circuit addressed the second variety of false misbehavior claim-a claim that an officer filed a false misbehavior report in retaliation for the exercise of constitutionally protected rights-in Franco v. Kelly, 854 F.2d 584 (2d Cir.1988). In Franco, a prisoner alleged that correction officers filed a false misbehavior report against him in retaliation for his cooperation with an investigation by the state Inspector General into incidents of inmate abuse at Attica Correctional Facility. Franco, 854 F.2d at 586. The defendants moved for summary judgment, arguing that Plaintiff could not state a claim because he had received a disciplinary hearing that complied with Wolff v. McDonnell and resulted in a guilty finding based on "some evidence." Id. The trial court granted the defendants' motion, relying on Freeman. Id. The trial court noted, however, "that under [t]his reading of Freeman, the mere provision of procedural due process could eliminate all liability in any case in which prison officials had intentionally filed false and unfounded charges." Id. The Second Circuit settled "the substantial and troublesome questions raised in th[e] case" by holding

that "[a]lthough our decision in *Freeman* accords prison officials wide latitude in disciplining inmates as long as minimum constitutional procedures are employed, that latitude does not encompass conduct that infringes on an inmate's substantive constitutional rights" such as the prisoner's First Amendment rights of access to the courts and to petition for redress of grievances. *Id.* at 590 (citations omitted). Accordingly, the Second Circuit reversed the trial court's judgment and remanded the matter for further proceedings. *Id.* at 590-91.

In Jones v. Coughlin, 45 F.3d 677 (2d Cir.1995), the Second Circuit again clarified that the holding in Freeman is doctrinally different and distinct from the type of retaliation claim discussed in Franco. In Jones, a prisoner alleged that correction officers filed a false misbehavior report against him in retaliation for filing an administrative complaint against one of their colleagues. Jones, 45 F.3d at 678. At his disciplinary hearing, the prisoner was denied the opportunity to call witnesses. *Id.* He was found guilty and sentenced to serve 120 days in the SHU. Id. After he had served his SHU sentence, DOCS official Donald Selsky reversed the decision and expunged it from the prisoner's record. Id. at 679. The prisoner filed suit. Id. The trial court granted the prison officials' motion for summary judgment, finding that the prisoner's allegations against the corrections officers failed to state a claim under Freeman and that the prisoner's allegations against the hearing officer failed because any procedural due process defects in the hearing had been cured by Selsky's reversal of the decision. Id.

*23 On appeal, the Second Circuit stated that Freeman did not provide the "proper framework" for a decision in the case for both "factual and doctrinal reasons." Jones, 45 F.3d at 679. Factually, the case was distinguishable "if, as alleged, Jones was unfairly denied the right to call key witnesses in defense of the charges against him." Id. Doctrinally, the Second Circuit stated that "we have held that a prisoner has a substantive due process right not to be subjected to false misconduct charges as retaliation for his exercise of a constitutional right such as petitioning the government for redress of his grievances, and that this right is distinct from the

procedural due process claim at issue in *Freeman*." *Id.* at 679-80. The Second Circuit vacated the trial court's judgment and remanded for further proceedings. *Id.* at 680.

This brings us to Brewer. In Brewer, a prisoner alleged that correction officers filed false misbehavior reports against him in retaliation for filing grievances. Brewer, 533 F.Supp.2d at 323. The prisoner refused to attend his disciplinary hearing and was found guilty. Id. He sued the officers in federal court. Id. at 324. The officers moved for summary judgment. Id. The court granted the motion, finding that the prisoner could not establish that the disciplinary charges were false because (1) he refused to attend his disciplinary hearing; (2) he offered no "explanation as to why he chose not to attend the hearing so as to rebut the charges, or why it was otherwise constitutionally deficient"; and (3) he did not "offer ..., in opposition to [d]efendants' motion, any evidence calling into question the truth of the ... charges." Id. at 330. (citation omitted). Based on these three factors, the court stated that the plaintiff "was provided with the requisite opportunity to rebut the alleged false disciplinary charges, as required by due process, and Plaintiff, by failing to do so, has waived his right to further challenge the validity" of the misbehavior report. Id. (citation omitted).

Brewer is not applicable here for three reasons. First, the case is factually distinguishable. In Brewer, the prisoner did not offer any explanation for his refusal to attend the hearing, did not explain why the hearing was constitutionally deficient, and did not offer any evidence calling into question the truth of the charges. Brewer, 533 F.Supp.2d at 330. Here, Plaintiff has explained that he did not attend the hearing because Defendant LaClair refused to assist him prepare a defense, has argued that the hearing was constitutionally deficient because Defendant Bullis did not call Defendant LaClair and an inmate as witnesses, and has offered his own testimony under penalty of perjury to rebut Defendants' version of the events leading to the misbehavior reports.

Second, Defendants overstate the holding of Brewer.

The court did not hold that the prisoner had forfeited his opportunity to present evidence calling into question the truth of the misbehavior report simply by refusing to attend the disciplinary hearing. Rather, the court held that the prisoner had waived his right for three reasons, with the refusal to attend being only one of them. <u>Brewer</u>, 533 F.Supp.2d at 330.

*24 Third, because the prisoner in Brewer asserted a retaliation claim rather than a procedural due process claim, the precedent relied upon by the Brewer court is puzzling. The portion of the decision cited at length by Defendants relies on (1) Freeman, which is a procedural due process case; (2) language from Jones that discusses the ways in which Jones was factually distinguishable from Freeman, rather than the language in Jones clarifying that a retaliation claim is doctrinally different from the type of procedural due process claim at issue in Freeman; and (3) quotes from Franco that summarize the procedural due process holding in Freeman, rather than quotes from Franco discussing the proper analysis of a retaliation claim. Thus, although the prisoner in Brewer raised a retaliation claim, the court analyzed it as a procedural due process claim.

Because I find that *Brewer* is factually distinguishable from Plaintiff's case, that the holding in *Brewer* is not as broad as Defendants suggest, and that *Brewer's* legal analysis rests on a line of cases to which the Second Circuit has referred as the improper framework for analyzing a retaliation claim, I recommend that the Court reject Defendants' argument that Plaintiff waived his claim regarding the allegedly false and retaliatory misbehavior reports by failing to appear at his disciplinary hearing. FNSO

FN50. I note that *Howard v. Wilkerson*, 768 F.Supp. 1002 (S.D.N.Y.1991) holds that "[a]n inmate's refusal to attend a disciplinary hearing waives his *due process objections* ... only when it occurs through no fault of prison officials." *Howard*, 768 F.Supp. at 1006 (citation and quotation marks omitted) (emphasis added). *Howard* is cited in *Nance v. Villafranca*, No. 91-CV-717, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11114

(N.D.N.Y. June 20, 1994), which Defendants cite for a different proposition. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 39.)

b. Regardless of retaliatory motive

Defendants argue that there is "ample evidence" that Defendants "would have issued the misbehavior report[s] regardless of whether [P]laintiff threatened to sue them." (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 28, 30.)

"An allegation that a prison official filed false disciplinary charges in retaliation for the exercise of a constitutionally protected right ... states a claim under § 1983. A plaintiff alleging retaliatory punishment bears the burden of showing that the conduct at issue was constitutionally protected and that the protected conduct was a substantial or motivating factor in the prison officials' decision to discipline the plaintiff. The burden then shifts to the defendant to show that the plaintiff would have received the same punishment even absent the retaliatory motivation. The defendant can meet this burden by demonstrating that there is no dispute that the plaintiff committed the most serious, if not all, of the prohibited conduct charged in the misbehavior report." Gayle v. Gonyea, 313 F.3d 677, 682 (2d Cir.2002) (citations and quotation marks omitted).

Here, the misbehavior reports by Defendants Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder charged Plaintiff with creating a disturbance, committing an unhygenic act, refusing a direct order, and making threats. (Dkt. No. 92-5, Ex. 11.) As the Second Circuit explained in Hynes v. Squillace, 143 F.3d 653 (2d Cir.1998), the "most serious charge" in a misbehavior report that includes charges of creating a disturbance, making threats, and refusing a direct order is the direct order charge. Hynes, 143 F.3d at 655, 657. Here, Plaintiff admits that he did not put on his coat when Defendant Nephew ordered him to do so. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 15.) Thus, Defendants have met their burden of showing that Plaintiff would have received the same punishment even absent the allegedly retaliatory motive by demonstrating that there is no dispute that Plaintiff committed the most serious of the prohibited conduct charged in the misbehavior report. Therefore, I

recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss the retaliation claims against Defendants Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder arising from the January 2, 2003, misbehavior reports.

*25 The misbehavior report by Defendant Wright charged Plaintiff with committing an unhygenic act, harassment, and threats. FNS1 (Dkt. No. 92-5, Ex. 11.) The most serious of these charges was the threat charge.

FN51. Although Defendants assert that Wright charged Plaintiff with disobeying a direct order, the evidence before the court does not support that assertion. (Dkt. No. 92-5, Exs.11-12.)

Plaintiff admits that when Defendant Wright asked him to explain what happened in the frisk room, Plaintiff "responded that Wright would not believe his account of the incident, that Wright had unjustifiably interfered with [his] court trip ... and that [Plaintiff] would sue Wright and Snyder for their unlawful acts and actions." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 16.) This is certainly an admission to the harassment charge. DOCS Rule 107.11 provides as follows: "An inmate shall not harass an employee or any other person verbally or in writing. Prohibited conduct includes, but is not limited to, using insolent, abusive, or obscene language or gestures." N.Y. Comp.Codes R. & Regs., tit. 7, § 270.2(B)(8)(ii). However, it is not an admission to the threat charge, which requires that "[i]nmate[s] shall not ... make any threat, spoken, in writing, or by gesture." N.Y. Comp.Codes R. & Regs., tit. 7, § 270.2(B) (3)(I). Therefore, I recommend that the Court deny Defendants' motion for summary judgment regarding the retaliation claim against Defendant Wright.

5. Failure to Intervene

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Bezio violated his constitutional rights by failing to intervene to protect Plaintiff from Defendants Duprat, Bogett, and Snyder. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 19-20.) Defendants move for summary judgment, arguing that there was no underlying constitutional violation with which to intervene. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 36-37.)

Law enforcement officials can be held liable under § 1983 for not intervening in a situation where another officer is violating an inmate's constitutional rights. Jean-Laurent v. Wilkinson, 540 F.Supp.2d 501, 512 (S.D.N.Y.2008) (citation omitted). A state actor may be held liable for failing to prevent another state actor from committing a constitutional violation if "(1) the officer had a realistic opportunity to intervene and prevent the harm; (2) a reasonable person in the officer's position would know that the victim's constitutional rights were being violated; and (3) the officer does not take reasonable steps to intervene." Id. (citation omitted); see also Ricciuti v. N.Y.C. Transit Auth., 124 F.3d 123, 129 (2d Cir.1997) ("Failure to intercede to prevent an unlawful arrest can be grounds for § 1983 liability."). Whether an officer can be held liable on a failure to intervene theory is generally a question of fact for the jury to decide. See Anderson v. Branen, 17 F.3d 552, 557 (2d Cir.1994) ("Whether an officer had sufficient time to intercede or was capable of preventing the harm being caused by another officer is an issue of fact for the jury unless, considering all the evidence, a reasonable jury could not possibly conclude otherwise.").

Here, a jury could determine that Defendant Bezio failed to intervene to protect Plaintiff. Plaintiff's verified complaint states that on the day before the incident he asked Defendant Bezio to protect him while he was being transported to court. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 19.) Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Duprat made a threatening comment as he escorted Plaintiff to the transportation van and that Plaintiff informed Defendant Bezio of the threat before they reached the van. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 20.) Defendant Bezio merely shrugged his shoulders. Id. None of the defendants has filed an affidavit contradicting Plaintiff's version of events. As discussed above, there is a triable issue of fact that a constitutional violation occurred with which Defendant Bezio could have intervened. Therefore, I recommend that the Court deny Defendants' motion for summary judgment regarding the failure to intervene claim against Defendant Bezio. FN52

<u>FN52.</u> Read broadly, the complaint asserts a retaliation claim against Defendant Bezio based

on these same events and a failure to intervene claim against Defendant Duprat because he was present when Defendant Snyder initially beat Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 21.) Defendants have not moved for summary judgment of these claims. I find that these claims are sufficient to withstand sua sponte review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

6. Grievances

*26 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Brousseau, Donelli, Girdich, and Eagen violated his constitutional rights by refusing to allow him to file a grievance regarding the events of January 2 and 3, 2003. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 30-34.) Defendants move for summary judgment, arguing that Plaintiff has not stated a constitutional claim. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 38.) As discussed above in Section III(B)(3), Defendants are correct. Therefore, I recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion and dismiss the claims against Defendants Brousseau, Donelli, Girdich, and Eagen regarding the handling of Plaintiff's grievances.

D. Disciplinary Hearing/Sentence

Plaintiff raises several claims regarding the conduct of his disciplinary hearing, his disciplinary sentence, and his appeal of the sentence. Specifically, he claims that (1) Defendant LaClair violated his right to due process by falsifying a misbehavior report against Plaintiff to avoid serving as Plaintiff's pre-hearing assistant (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 35); (2) Defendant Bullis violated his due process rights by failing to call an inmate and Defendant LaClair as witnesses (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 36-37); (3) Defendant Bullis violated his Eighth Amendment rights by sentencing him to a 21-day loaf diet (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 36-37) and Defendants Weissman and Girdich violated his Eighth Amendment rights by approving the loaf diet (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 38); and (4) Defendant Selsky violated Plaintiff's right to due process by affirming Defendant Bullis' disposition (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 40).

1. LaClair

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant LaClair falsified a misbehavior report against him in order to avoid serving

as Plaintiff's pre-hearing assistant "and for the purpose of depriving Benitez of due process." $\frac{FN53}{2}$ (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 35.)

FN53. The only version of the events between Defendant LaClair and Plaintiff in evidence before the Court is Defendant LaClair's misbehavior report. According to that report, when Defendant LaClair went to Plaintiff's cell to assist him, Plaintiff "stated ... that [LaClair] was to get [him] what he wanted." Defendant LaClair "informed him that what he needed had to be pertained (sic) to the misbehavior report. [Plaintiff] then stated "Get what I want or I'll fuck you up." Defendant LaClair "informed him the interview was over and left the area." (Dkt. No. 92-5, Ex. 15 at 2-3.) Although Plaintiff states in his verified complaint that Defendant LaClair "intentionally and maliciously falsified" the report, he does not offer any other version of what happened. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 35.) He alleges that he asked Defendant Bullis to "interview inmate Rolan and LaClair regarding the acts and actions of LaClair that caused him not to provide Benitez pre-hearing assistance," but he does not provide any information about what those interviews might have revealed. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 36.) Due to Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with pages of the SHU log book for January 14, 2003, Plaintiff asks the Court to draw an adverse inference that "were Defendants to provide the Court with the missing pages of the ... log book ... such pages would not support any of the allegations of misconduct set out in the misbehavior report that LaClair filed against Benitez on that date." (Dkt. No. 109 at 41 n. 14.) Plaintiff does not explain, however, why such an inference is logical.

In order to state a claim for violation of his procedural due process rights, a plaintiff must allege facts plausibly suggesting that he was deprived of a liberty interest without due process of law. <u>Tellier v. Fields</u>, 280 F.3d 69, 79-80 (2d Cir.2000).

Punishment implicates a protected liberty interest

where (1) the state has granted its inmates, by regulation or statute, an interest in remaining free from that particular punishment; and (2) the punishment imposes "an atypical and significant hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life." *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 483-84, 115 S.Ct. 2293, 132 L.Ed.2d 418 (1995); *Tellier*, 280 F.3d at 80; *Frazier v. Coughlin*, 81 F.3d 313, 317 (2d Cir.1996).

Here, no liberty interest is implicated. As a result of being found guilty of the disciplinary charges, Plaintiff was sentenced to a loaf diet. The Second Circuit has held that the imposition of a loaf diet does not impose an atypical and significant hardship on inmates, even where the inmate alleges that the diet caused severe stomach pain and weight loss. *McEachin v. McGuinnis*, 357 F.3d 197 (2d Cir.2004). Therefore, I recommend that the Court dismiss Plaintiff's due process claim against Defendant LaClair. FNS4

FN54. Although Defendants argue, in regard to Plaintiff's other claims regarding his disciplinary hearing, that due process was not required because no liberty interest was implicated by the imposition of the loaf diet, they did not assert that argument regarding the claim against Defendant LaClair. Rather, Defendants argue that Plaintiff waived Defendant LaClair's assistance by threatening him. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 38-39.) Due process requires that prison officials provide pre-hearing assistance to a prisoner facing disciplinary charges who is confined to the SHU. Eng v. Coughlin, 858 F.2d 889 (2d Cir.1988). "An assistant's role is to act as merely a surrogate for the inmate, not a legal advisor or advocate. [A]n assistant's role is to perform tasks like interviewing witnesses that the inmate would perform himself if her were in the general population." Jackson v. Johnson, 30 F.Supp.2d 613, 619 (S.D.N.Y.1998) (citations and punctuation omitted). The assistance "must be provided in good faith and in the best interests of the inmate." Ayers v. Ryan, 152 F.3d 77, 81 (2d Cir.1998) (citation omitted). An "assigned

assistant who does nothing to assist a ... prisoner ... has failed to accord the prisoner his limited constitutional due process right of assistance." Eng, 858 F.2d at 898. Defendants cite several cases holding that an inmate may waive his right to assistance by remaining silent when assistance is offered or by refusing to sign a form requesting assistance. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 39, citing inter alia, Jackson, 30 F.Supp.2d at 619.) However, Defendants have not cited any cases holding that an inmate waives his right to assistance by threatening his assistant. In light of my finding that Plaintiff was not deprived of a liberty interest, it is not necessary to reach this issue.

2. Failure to Call Witnesses

*27 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Bullis violated his right to due process by failing to call the witnesses that Plaintiff requested. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 37.) Defendants move for summary judgment, arguing that Plaintiff cannot state a due process claim because he was not deprived of a liberty interest. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 39-40.) As discussed above, Defendants are correct. *McEachin*, 357 F.2d at 200. Therefore, I recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismiss this claim.

3. Imposition of Loaf Diet

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Bullis violated his Eighth Amendment rights by imposing the loaf diet on him and that Defendants Weissman and Girdich violated his Eighth Amendment rights by approving the punishment. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 37-38.) Defendants move for summary judgment of the claim, arguing that (a) Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies; and (b) Defendants were not deliberately indifferent. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 14-20.)

a. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Defendants argue that Plaintiff did not exhaust his administrative remedies regarding his Eighth Amendment claims against Defendant Bullis because he did not appeal the grievance he filed regarding Defendant Bullis' imposition of the loaf diet to the CORC. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 14.) Defendants argue that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding his Eighth Amendment claim against Defendants Weissman and Girdich because he did not file a grievance at all. (*Id.* at 15.)

DOCS has a separate and distinct administrative process for inmates to appeal the result of disciplinary hearings, which is not referred to as a "grievance" process. N.Y. Comp.Codes R. & Regs. tit.7, § 701.3(e)(1)-(2). For Tier III superintendent hearings, such as Plaintiff's, the inmate must file an appeal with Donald Selsky, DOCS Director of Special Housing/Inmate Disciplinary Program, pursuant to New York Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations, title 7, section 254.8. The appeal must be filed within 30 days of the inmate's receipt of the hearing officer's written disposition. N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit.7, § 254.8. Plaintiff raised the issue of the loaf diet in his appeal of the disciplinary sentence. (P.'s Decl. in Opp'n to Aff. of Karen Bellamy, Ex. D.) Defendant Selsky denied the appeal. Id. at Ex. E. Therefore, Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies as to his claim against Defendant Bullis.

Plaintiff declares that on January 18, 2003, he submitted a grievance to Defendant Brousseau complaining about Defendant Bullis' imposition of, and Defendants Weissman and Girdich's approval of, the loaf diet. (P.'s Decl. in Opp'n to Aff. of Karen Bellamy, ¶ 26.) He declares that Defendant Brousseau "deliberately refused to file and process the grievance ... in order to prevent me from suing the officials named in the grievance." *Id.* ¶ 27. Therefore, as discussed above, there is a question of fact that Defendants are estopped from asserting the exhaustion defense.

b. Deliberate Indifference

*28 Defendants argue that Plaintiff has not raised a triable issue of fact that Defendants Bullis, Weissman, and Girdich acted with deliberate indifference when they ordered and approved that the loaf diet be imposed on Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 15-20.) Defendants are correct.

Where a prisoner claims that punishment imposed following a disciplinary hearing violates his Eighth Amendment rights, the proper analysis of the subjective prong of the claim requires the court to "consider whether the [o]rder was reasonably calculated to restore prison discipline and security and, in that ... context, whether the officials were deliberately indifferent to [the prisoner's] health and safety." *Trammell v. Keane*, 338 F.3d 155, 163 (2d Cir.2003).

Here, the order imposing the loaf diet on Plaintiff was reasonably calculated to restore prison discipline and security. DOCS regulation allow the imposition of the loaf diet as punishment where, inter alia, the inmate is found guilty of committing unhygenic acts in the SHU or the inmate is a long-term SHU inmate who is disruptive and who has lost all other available privileges. (Dkt. No. 92-8, Bezio Aff., ¶ 5.) Here, Plaintiff was found guilty of committing unhygenic acts in the SHU. Moreover, Plaintiff is a long-term SHU inmate (he will remain in the SHU until June 3, 2021, and in keeplock until July 1, 2025) who has lost package, commissary, and phone privileges and has lost 11 years worth of good time credits. (Bezio Aff., § 6.) Therefore, the imposition of the loaf diet was reasonably calculated to restore prison discipline.

There is no evidence that Defendants Bullis, Weissman, and Girdich acted with deliberate indifference when they imposed and approved of the loaf diet. To establish deliberate indifference, an inmate must prove that (1) the defendant was aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that the inmate had a serious medical need; and (2) the defendant actually drew that inference. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 837; Chance, 143 F.3d at 702-703. Here, although Plaintiff told Defendant Bullis that the loaf diet would cause him severe abdominal pains and constipation due to his hepatitis (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 36), his medical record did not support his assertion. Dr. Weissman declares that "there is nothing in his medical record that indicates that [Plaintiff] is medically unable to receive the restricted diet penalty ... [T]he fact that [P]laintiff is Hepatitis C positive does not mean he cannot receive the restricted diet because Hepatitis C is not a

contraindication for the restricted diet." (Weissman Aff. ¶¶ 14-15.) Thus, there is no evidence in the record indicating that Defendants Bullis, Weissman, and Girdich were aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that the loaf diet would harm Plaintiff or that they drew that inference. Moreover, Plaintiff admits that he refused to eat the loaf diet. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 39.) Accordingly, any weight loss and pain that he experienced could not have resulted from the loaf diet itself. Accordingly, I recommend that the Court grant Defendants' motion and dismiss Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claims against Defendants Bullis, Weissman, and Girdich.

4. Selsky

*29 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Selsky affirmed Defendant Bullis' "disciplinary determination, even though he knew or should have known that Bullis violated [Plaintiff]'s clearly established due process rights." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 40.) Defendants' motion for summary judgment does not directly address this claim. However, I find that it is subject to *sua sponte* dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because, as discussed above, Defendant Bullis did not violate Plaintiff's due process rights. Therefore, I recommend that the Court dismiss the claim against Defendant Selsky.

E. Five Points Health Care

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Hensel, Goodwin, Kuhlman, and Costello violated his Eighth Amendment rights by failing to provide adequate medical care at Five Points Correctional Facility following the alleged beating by Defendants Snyder, Duprat, and Bogett. (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 23-26.) Defendants move for summary judgment, arguing that (1) Plaintiff failed to serve Defendant Kuhlman; and (2) Plaintiff cannot raise a triable issue of fact that these Defendants violated his Eighth Amendment rights because Plaintiff did not suffer from a serious medical need and Defendants were not deliberately indifferent. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 6, 20.)

1. Failure to Serve Defendant Kuhlman

Defendants argue that the claim against Defendant Kuhlman must be dismissed because she was not served

within 120 days of the filing of the amended complaint on October 6, 2004. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 6.) Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a defendant must be served with the summons and complaint within 120 days FN55 after the filing of the complaint. Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m). The court "must" extend the time for service for an appropriate period if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure to serve. *Id*.

FN55. This 120-day service period is shortened, or "expedited," by the Court's Local Rules of Practice (and the Court's General Order 25), which provide that all defendants must be served with the summons and complaint within sixty (60) days of the filing of the complaint. N.D.N.Y. L.R. 4.1(b) (emphasis added).

Here, on June 24, 2005, the summons was returned unexecuted as to Defendant "Coleman." (Dkt. No. 21.) On May 22, 2007, the Clerk's office sent Plaintiff a letter informing him that the Marshals Service had not been able to serve the defendant because there was no one by that name at Five Points Correctional Facility. The Clerk's office provided Plaintiff with another USM-285 form and asked for more information about the defendant. (Dkt. No. 54.) Plaintiff states that he was not able to ascertain Defendant Kuhlman's correct identity until after I issued orders on May 2, 2007, and October 3, 2007, compelling defendants to respond to discovery. (Dkt. No. 109 at 7-8.) The docket shows that on January 31, 2008, Plaintiff attempted to file an amended complaint "correctly identif[ying] defendant Kulhman by substituting the name 'Coleman' ... for 'Kuhlman.'" (Dkt. No. 74.) On February 4, 2008, I ordered Plaintiff's motion stricken from the record because the deadline for filing motions to amend had expired on January 30, 2006. (Dkt. No. 75.) I find, therefore, that Plaintiff has demonstrated good cause for his failure to serve Nurse Kuhlman.

2. Merits

*30 Plaintiff claims that Defendants Hensel, Goodwin, Kuhlman, and Costello violated his Eighth Amendment rights by refusing to treat him for head pain, pain in his liver, pain in his left wrist, and severe body itch. Plaintiff also alleges that he informed Defendant Hensel that "he had ... lost blood from within his right ear." (Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 23-26.) Defendants argue that Plaintiff has not raised a triable issue of fact as to either the objective or subjective prong of his Eighth Amendment medical care claim. (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 20.)

As discussed above, the objective prong of an Eighth Amendment medical claim requires the court to determine whether the prisoner was deprived of adequate medical care and, if so, whether the inadequacy was sufficiently Salahuddin, 467 F.3d at 279-80. Where the prisoner alleges that he was completely deprived of treatment, the court must examine whether the inmate's medical condition is sufficiently serious. Id. at 280. Here, because Plaintiff alleges that he was totally deprived of medical care, I must consider whether the bleeding in his inner right ear, head pain, pain in his liver, pain in his left wrist, and severe body itch are "serious medical conditions," in other words, whether they are conditions "of urgency that may produce death, degeneration, or extreme pain." Id.; Nance v. Kelly, 912 F.2d 605, 607 (2d Cir.1990) (Pratt, J. dissenting).

Defendants argue, without analysis, that none of Plaintiff's "conditions constitute a condition of urgency, one that may produce death, degeneration, or extreme pain." (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 20.) As discussed above in regard to Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Weissman and Richardson, I agree that Plaintiff's severe body itch is not a serious medical condition. However, Plaintiff's bleeding inner ear, head pain, and liver pain, as alleged, appear urgent and capable of producing extreme pain. See Bjorkstrand v. DuBose, No. CIV. S-08-1531, 2008 WL 5386637, at * 3 (E.D.Cal. Dec.24, 2008) (finding that dried blood in ear was not a serious medical condition because "there was no emergency problem with the left ear, such as active bleeding."). I therefore find that Defendants have not met their burden of showing that they are entitled to judgment as a matter of law on the issue of whether Plaintiff suffered from a serious medical condition.

Defendants argue that Plaintiff cannot raise a triable issue of material fact as to deliberate indifference because

the issue of "[w]hether or not [P]laintiff needed treatment or to be seen by a physician amounts to nothing more than a disagreement with the course of treatment-not deliberate indifference." (Dkt. No. 92-10 at 20.) As Plaintiff notes (Dkt. No. 109 at 37), none of the named Five Points Defendants has filed an affidavit supporting Defendants' motion for summary judgment. They have therefore not established that their treatment of Plaintiff was based on their medical judgment. The evidence, when viewed in the light most favorable to Plaintiff, indicates that he arrived at Five Points on January 3 complaining of severe pain inflicted through excessive force and that he received absolutely no treatment for his injuries until Nurse Gardner examined him on January 7. Therefore, I find that Plaintiff has raised a triable issue of fact that Defendants Hensel, Goodwin, Kuhlman, and Costello violated his Eighth Amendment right to adequate medical treatment.

*31 ACCORDINGLY, it is

RECOMMENDED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 92) be *GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART;* and it is further

RECOMMENDED that the following claims be dismissed pursuant to Defendants' motion for summary judgment: (1) the Eighth Amendment claims against Defendants Weissman and Richards arising from their treatment of Plaintiff's severe body itch, left wrist, and right ankle; (2) the claims against Defendant Ham; (3) the claims against Defendants Brousseau and Donelli for their handling of Plaintiff's grievance regarding Defendant Ham; (4) the retaliation claim against Defendants Nephew, Desotelle, and Snyder based on their filing of misbehavior reports against Plaintiff; (5) the claims against Defendants Brousseau, Donelli, Girdich, and Eagen regarding their handling of Plaintiff's grievances regarding the events of January 2 and 3, 2003; (6) the claim against Defendant LaClair; (7) the claims against Defendant Bullis; and (8) the Eighth Amendment claim against Defendants Weissman and Girdich for approving the imposition of the loaf diet; and it is further

RECOMMENDED that the following claims be

dismissed sua sponte pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B): (1) Plaintiff's retaliation claim against Defendants Weissman and Richards; and (2) the claim against Defendant Selsky; and it is further

RECOMMENDED that the following claims survive summary judgment and *sua sponte* review and proceed to trial: (1) the conspiracy claim against Defendants Wright, Snyder, and Duprat; (2) the excessive force claim against Defendants Snyder, Duprat, Bogett, and Wright; (3) the retaliation claim against Defendants Snyder, Duprat, Bogett, and Wright arising from the use of excessive force; (4) the retaliation claim against Wright arising from his filing of a misbehavior report against Plaintiff; (5) the failure to intervene claims against Defendants Bezio and Duprat; (6) the retaliation claim against Defendant Bezio; and (7) the Eighth Amendment claims against Defendants Hensel, Goodwin, Kuhlman, and Costello; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk provide Plaintiff with Form USM 285 for service on Defendant Kuhlman; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk serve copies of *Miller v*. Bailey, No. 05-CV-5493, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31863, 2008 WL 1787692 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 17, 2008); Odom v. Poirier, No. 99 Civ. 4933, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25059, 2004 WL 2884409 (S.D.N.Y. Dec.10, 2004); Warren v. Purcell, No. 03 Civ. 8736, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17792, 2004 WL 1970642 (S.D.N.Y. Sept.3, 2004); Bond v. Board of Educ. of City of New York, 97-cv-1337, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3164, 1999 WL 151702 (W.D.N.Y. Mar.17, 1999); Medina v. Hunt, No. 9:05-CV-1460, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 74205, 2008 WL 4426748 (N.D.N.Y. Sept.25, 2008); Hill v. City of New York, No.03 CV 1283, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38926, 2005 WL 3591719 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 30, 2005); and Mendez v. Artuz, No. 01 CIV. 4157, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3263, 2002 WL 313796 (S.D.N.Y. Feb.27, 2002) on Plaintiff in accordance with the Second Circuit's decision in LeBron v. Sanders, 557 F.3d 76 (2d Cir.2009).

*32 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties have ten days within which to file written objections to the

Slip Copy, 2009 WL 3486379 (N.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2009 WL 3486379 (N.D.N.Y.))

foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court. FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. Roldan v. Racette, 984 F.2d 85 (2d Cir.1993) (citing Small v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 892 F.2d 15 (2d Cir.1989)); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed.R.Civ.P. 72, 6(a), 6(e).

N.D.N.Y.,2009.

Benitez v. Ham Slip Copy, 2009 WL 3486379 (N.D.N.Y.) END OF DOCUMENT



• Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, N.D. New York.

Jerome WALDO, Plaintiff,

v.

Glenn S. GOORD, Acting Commissioner of New York State Department of Correctional Services; Peter J. Lacy, Superintendent at Bare Hill Corr. Facility; Wendell Babbie, Acting Superintendent at Altona Corr. Facility; and John Doe, Corrections Officer at Bare Hill Corr. Facility, Defendants.

No. 97-CV-1385 LEK DRH.

Oct. 1, 1998.

Jerome Waldo, Plaintiff, pro se, Mohawk Correctional Facility, Rome, for Plaintiff.

Hon. Dennis C. Vacco, Attorney General of the State of New York, Albany, Eric D. Handelman, Esq., Asst. Attorney General, for Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

KAHN, District J.

*1 This matter comes before the Court following a Report-Recommendation filed on August 21, 1998 by the Honorable David R. Homer, Magistrate Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and L.R. 72.3(c) of the Northern District of New York.

No objections to the Report-Recommendation have been raised. Furthermore, after examining the record, the Court has determined that the Report-Recommendation is not clearly erroneous. SeeFed.R.Civ.P. 72(b), Advisory

Committee Notes. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report-Recommendation for the reasons stated therein.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Report-Recommendation is APPROVED and ADOPTED; and it is further

ORDERED that the motion to dismiss by defendants is GRANTED; and it is further

ORDERED that the complaint is dismissed without prejudice as to the unserved John Doe defendant pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P.4(m), and the action is therefore dismissed in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties by regular mail.

IT IS SO ORDERED. HOMER, Magistrate J.

REPORT-RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER FN1

<u>FN1.</u> This matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>636(b)</u> and N.D.N.Y.L.R. 72.3(c).

The plaintiff, an inmate in the New York Department of Correctional Services ("DOCS"), brought this pro se action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges that while incarcerated in Bare Hill Correctional Facility ("Bare Hill") and Altona Correctional Facility ("Altona"), defendants violated his rights under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. FN2 In particular, plaintiff alleges that prison officials maintained overcrowded facilities resulting in physical and emotional injury to the plaintiff

and failed to provide adequate medical treatment for his injuries and drug problem. Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief and monetary damages. Presently pending is defendants' motion to dismiss pursuant to <u>Fed.R.Civ.P.</u> 12(b). Docket No. 18. For the reasons which follow, it is recommended that the motion be granted in its entirety.

FN2. The allegations as to Bare Hill are made against defendants Goord, Lacy, and Doe. Allegations as to Altona are made against Goord and Babbie.

I. Background

Plaintiff alleges that on August 21, 1997 at Bare Hill, while he and two other inmates were playing cards, an argument ensued, and one of the two assaulted him. Compl., ¶ 17. Plaintiff received medical treatment for facial injuries at the prison infirmary and at Malone County Hospital. *Id.* at ¶¶ 18-19. On September 11, 1997, plaintiff was transferred to Altona and went to Plattsburgh Hospital for x-rays several days later. *Id.* at ¶ 21.

Plaintiff's complaint asserts that the overcrowded conditions at Bare Hill created a tense environment which increased the likelihood of violence and caused the physical assault on him by another inmate. *Id.* at ¶¶ 10-11. Additionally, plaintiff contends that similar conditions at Altona caused him mental distress and that he received constitutionally deficient medical treatment for his injuries. *Id.* at ¶¶ 21-22. The complaint alleges that Altona's lack of a drug treatment program and a dentist or specialist to treat his facial injuries constitutes cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. *Id.* at ¶¶ 22, 27-28.

II. Motion to Dismiss

*2 When considering a Rule 12(b) motion, a court must assume the truth of all factual allegations in the complaint and draw all reasonable inferences from those facts in favor of the plaintiff. Leeds v. Meltz, 85 F.3d 51, 53 (2d Cir.1996). The complaint may be dismissed only when "it

appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." Staron v. McDonald's Corp., 51 F.3d 353, 355 (2d Cir.1995) (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957)). "The issue is not whether a plaintiff is likely to prevail ultimately, but whether the claimant is entitled to offer evidence to support the claims. Indeed, it may appear on the face of the pleading that a recovery is very remote and unlikely, but that is not the test." Gant v. Wallingford Bd. of Educ., 69 F.3d 669, 673 (2d Cir.1995) (citations omitted). This standard receives especially careful application in cases such as this where a pro se plaintiff claims violations of his civil rights. Hernandez v. Coughlin, 18 F.3d 133, 136 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 836, 115 S.Ct. 117, 130 L.Ed.2d 63 (1994).

III. Discussion

A. Conditions of Confinement

Defendants assert that plaintiff fails to state a claim regarding the conditions of confinement at Bare Hill and Altona. For conditions of confinement to amount to cruel and unusual punishment, a two-prong test must be met. First, plaintiff must show a sufficiently serious deprivation. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 834, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994) (citing Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 298, 111 S.Ct. 2321, 115 L.Ed.2d 271 (1991)); Rhodes v. Chapman, 452 U.S. 347, 348 (1981)(denial of the "minimal civilized measure of life's necessities"). Second, plaintiff must show that the prison official involved was both "aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exist[ed]" and that the official drew the inference. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 837.

1. Bare Hill

In his Bare Hill claim, plaintiff alleges that the overcrowded and understaffed conditions in the dormitory-style housing "resulted in an increase in tension, mental anguish and frustration among prisoners, and dangerously increased the potential for violence." Compl.,

¶ 11. Plaintiff asserts that these conditions violated his constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment and led to the attack on him by another prisoner. The Supreme Court has held that double-celling to manage prison overcrowding is not a per se violation of the Eighth Amendment. Rhodes, 452 U.S. at 347-48. The Third Circuit has recognized, though, that double-celling paired with other adverse circumstances can create a totality of conditions amounting to cruel and unusual punishment. Nami v. Fauver, 82 F.3d 63, 67 (3d Cir.1996). While plaintiff here does not specify double-celling as the source of his complaint, the concerns he raises are similar. Plaintiff alleges that overcrowding led to an increase in tension and danger which violated his rights. Plaintiff does not claim, however, that he was deprived of any basic needs such as food or clothing, nor does he assert any injury beyond the fear and tension allegedly engendered by the overcrowding. Further, a previous lawsuit by this plaintiff raised a similar complaint, that double-celling and fear of assault amounted to cruel and unusual punishment, which was rejected as insufficient by the court. Bolton v. Goord, 992 F.Supp. 604, 627 (S.D.N.Y.1998). The court there found that the fear created by the double-celling was not "an objectively serious enough injury to support a claim for damages." Id. (citing Doe v. Welborn, 110 F.3d 520, 524 (7th Cir.1997)).

*3 As in his prior complaint, plaintiff's limited allegations of overcrowding and fear, without more, are insufficient. Compare Ingalls v. Florio, 968 F.Supp. 193, 198 (D.N.J.1997) (Eighth Amendment overcrowding claim stated when five or six inmates are held in cell designed for one, inmates are required to sleep on floor, food is infested, and there is insufficient toilet paper) and Zolnowski v. County of Erie, 944 F.Supp. 1096, 1113 (W.D.N.Y.1996) (Eighth Amendment claim stated when overcrowding caused inmates to sleep on mattresses on floor, eat meals while sitting on floor, and endure vomit on the floor and toilets) with Harris v. Murray, 761 F.Supp. 409, 415 (E.D.Va.1990) (No Eighth Amendment claim when plaintiff makes only a generalized claim of overcrowding unaccompanied by any specific claim concerning the adverse effects of overcrowding). Thus, although overcrowding could create conditions which might state a violation of the Eighth Amendment, plaintiff has not alleged sufficient facts to support such a finding here. Plaintiff's conditions of confinement claim as to Bare

Hill should be dismissed.

2. Altona

Plaintiff also asserts a similar conditions of confinement claim regarding Altona. For the reasons discussed above, plaintiff's claim that he suffered anxiety and fear of other inmates in the overcrowded facility (Compl., ¶¶ 21-22) is insufficient to establish a serious injury or harm.

Plaintiff's second claim regarding Altona relates to the alleged inadequacies of the medical treatment he received. The government has an "obligation to provide medical care for those whom it is punishing by incarceration." *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 103, 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976). The two-pronged *Farmer* standard applies in medical treatment cases as well. *Hemmings v. Gorczyk*, 134 F.3d 104, 108 (2d Cir.1998). Therefore, plaintiff must allege facts which would support a finding that he suffered a sufficiently serious deprivation of his rights and that the prison officials acted with deliberate indifference to his medical needs. *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834.

Plaintiff alleges that the medical treatment available at Altona was insufficient to address the injuries sustained in the altercation at Bare Hill. Specifically, plaintiff cites the lack of a dentist or specialist to treat his facial injuries as an unconstitutional deprivation. Plaintiff claims that the injuries continue to cause extreme pain, nosebleeds, and swelling. Compl., ¶¶ 22 & 26. For the purposes of the Rule 12(b) motion, plaintiff's allegations of extreme pain suffice for a sufficiently serious deprivation. See Hathaway v. Coughlin, 99 F.3d 550, 553 (2d Cir.1996).

Plaintiff does not, however, allege facts sufficient to support a claim of deliberate indifference by the named defendants. To satisfy this element, plaintiff must demonstrate that prison officials had knowledge of facts from which an inference could be drawn that a "substantial risk of serious harm" to the plaintiff existed and that the officials actually drew the inference. <u>Farmer</u>, 511 U.S. at 837. Plaintiff's complaint does not support, even when liberally construed, any such conclusion. Plaintiff offers

no evidence that the Altona Superintendent or DOCS Commissioner had any actual knowledge of his medical condition or that he made any attempts to notify them of his special needs. Where the plaintiff has not even alleged knowledge of his medical needs by the defendants, no reasonable jury could conclude that the defendants were deliberately indifferent to those needs. See <u>Amos v. Maryland Dep't of Public Safety and Corr. Services</u>, 126 F.3d 589, 610-11 (4th Cir.1997), vacated on other grounds, 524 U.S. 935, 118 S.Ct. 2339, 141 L.Ed.2d 710 (1998).

*4 Plaintiff's second complaint about Altona is that it offers "no type of state drug treatment program for the plaintiff." Compl., ¶ 22. Constitutionally required medical treatment encompasses drug addiction therapy. Fiallo v. de Batista, 666 F.2d 729, 731 (1st Cir.1981); Inmates of Allegheny County Jail v. Pierce, 612 F.2d 754, 760-61 (3d Cir.1979). As in the Fiallo case, however, plaintiff falls short of stating an Eighth Amendment claim as he "clearly does not allege deprivation of essential treatment or indifference to serious need, only that he has not received the type of treatment which he desires." Id. at 731. Further, plaintiff alleges no harm or injury attributable to the charged deprivation. Plaintiff has not articulated his reasons for desiring drug treatment or how he was harmed by the alleged deprivation of this service. See Guidry v. Jefferson County Detention Ctr., 868 F.Supp. 189, 192 (E.D.Tex.1994) (to state a section 1983 claim, plaintiff must allege that some injury has been suffered).

For these reasons, plaintiff's Altona claims should be dismissed.

B. Failure to Protect

Defendants further assert that plaintiff has not established that any of the named defendants failed to protect the plaintiff from the attack by the other inmate at Bare Hill. Prison officials have a duty "to act reasonably to ensure a safe environment for a prisoner when they are aware that there is a significant risk of serious injury to that prisoner." <u>Heisler v. Kralik</u>, 981 F.Supp. 830, 837 (S.D.N.Y.1997) (emphasis added); see also <u>Villante v. Dep't of Corr. of City of N.Y.</u>, 786 F.2d 516, 519 (2d

Cir.1986). This duty is not absolute, however, as "not ... every injury suffered by one prisoner at the hands of another ... translates into constitutional liability." *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834. To establish this liability, *Farmer's* familiar two-prong standard must be satisfied.

As in the medical indifference claim discussed above, plaintiff's allegations of broken bones and severe pain from the complained of assault suffice to establish a "sufficiently serious" deprivation. *Id.* Plaintiff's claim fails, however, to raise the possibility that he will be able to prove deliberate indifference to any threat of harm to him by the Bare Hill Superintendent or the DOCS Commissioner. Again, plaintiff must allege facts which establish that these officials were aware of circumstances from which the inference could be drawn that the plaintiff was at risk of serious harm and that they actually inferred this. *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 838.

To advance his claim, plaintiff alleges an increase in "unusual incidents, prisoner misbehaviors, and violence" (Compl., ¶ 12) and concludes that defendants' continued policy of overcrowding created the conditions which led to his injuries. Compl., ¶ 10. The thrust of plaintiff's claim seems to suggest that the defendants' awareness of the problems of overcrowding led to knowledge of a generalized risk to the prison population, thus establishing a legally culpable state of mind as to plaintiff's injuries. Plaintiff has not offered any evidence, however, to support the existence of any personal risk to himself about which the defendants could have known. According to his own complaint, plaintiff first encountered his assailant only minutes before the altercation occurred. Compl., ¶ 17. It is clear that the named defendants could not have known of a substantial risk to the plaintiff's safety if the plaintiff himself had no reason to believe he was in danger. See Sims v. Bowen, No. 96-CV-656, 1998 WL 146409, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Mar.23, 1998) (Pooler, J.) ("I conclude that an inmate must inform a correctional official of the basis for his belief that another inmate represents a substantial threat to his safety before the correctional official can be charged with deliberate indifference"); Strano v. City of New York, No. 97-CIV-0387, 1998 WL 338097, at *3-4 (S.D.N.Y. June 24, 1998) (when plaintiff acknowledged attack was "out of the blue" and no prior incidents had occurred to put defendants on notice of threat or danger, defendants could not be held aware of any substantial risk Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 1998 WL 713809 (N.D.N.Y.) (Cite as: 1998 WL 713809 (N.D.N.Y.))

of harm to the plaintiff). Defendants' motion on this ground should, therefore, be granted.

IV. Failure to Complete Service

*5 The complaint names four defendants, including one "John Doe" Correctional Officer at Bare Hill. Defendants acknowledge that service has been completed as to the three named defendants. Docket Nos. 12 & 13. The "John Doe" defendant has not been served with process or otherwise identified and it is unlikely that service on him will be completed in the near future. See Docket No. 6 (United States Marshal unable to complete service on "John Doe"). Since over nine months have passed since the complaint was filed (Docket No. 1) and summonses were last issued (Docket entry Oct. 21, 1997), the complaint as to the unserved defendant should be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m) and N.D. N.Y.L.R. 4.1(b).

V. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, it is

RECOMMENDED that defendants' motion to dismiss be GRANTED in all respects; and

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice as to the unserved John Doe defendant pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m) and N.D.N.Y.L.R. 4.1(b); and it is

ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court serve a copy of this Report-Recommendation and Order, by regular mail, upon parties to this action.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties may lodge written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court. FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. <u>Roldan v.</u>

© 2010 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

<u>Racette</u>, 984 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir.1993); <u>Small v. Secretary of Health and Human Services</u>, 892 F.2d 15 (2d <u>Cir.1989</u>); <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 636(b)(1); <u>Fed.R.Civ.P. 72</u>, <u>6(a)</u>, 6(e).

N.D.N.Y.,1998. Waldo v. Goord Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 1998 WL 713809 (N.D.N.Y.)

END OF DOCUMENT



Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2003 WL 22299359 (N.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2003 WL 22299359 (N.D.N.Y.))

C

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,

N.D. New York. Troy GARRETT, Plaintiff,

v.

Edward REYNOLDS, Superintendent, Mohawk Corr. Facility; James A. Mance, Deputy Superintendent of Programs; John O'Reilly, FNI Deputy Superintendent; J. Burge, First Deputy; M. Maher, DSS; R. Centore,

Correctional Officer, Defendants.

FN1. In this case, the defendants maintain and the docket confirms that defendant John O'Reilly has never been served. Service must be made upon a defendant within 120 days of filing the complaint or any claims against that defendant will be dismissed. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m). The original complaint, which named O'Reilly, was filed on November 26, 1999, and the amended complaint was filed on July 13, 2001. However, O'Reilly was never served. Since this defendant has never been served, this court lacks jurisdiction over him, and this court recommends the dismissal of this defendant.

No. Civ.9:99CV2065NAMGLS.

Oct. 7, 2003.

Troy Garrett, Peekskill, NY, Plaintiff, pro se.

Hon. Eliot Spitzer, Attorney General State of New York, Syracuse, NY, for the Defendants.

Maria Moran, Asst. Attorney General, of counsel.

REPORT-RECOMMENDATION

SHARPE, Magistrate J.

I. Introduction $\frac{FN2}{}$

FN2. This matter was referred to the undersigned for a Report-Recommendation by the Hon.

Norman A. Mordue, United States District Judge, pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72.3(c).

*1 Plaintiff, pro se Troy Garrett filed an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claiming that the defendants violated his civil rights when they retaliated against him for his activities as an IGRC representative by subjecting him to verbal harassment, physical abuse and subsequently, a transfer. Garrett also claims that the supervisory defendants failed to properly investigate his complaints and failed to train/supervise their employees. This court recommends denying the motion for summary judgment in part and granting it in part.

II. Procedural History

On July 13, 2001, Garrett filed an amended complaint against the defendants claiming that they violated his civil rights under the First, Sixth Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments. On September 28, 2001, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. On January 18, 2002, this court issued an order informing Garrett of his obligation to file a response and extended his time to respond for thirty days. On April 24, 2002, this court granted an additional sixty days to respond to the defendants' motion. Despite having been given multiple opportunities to respond, Garrett has failed to file a response.

FN3. Although Garrett claims to be raising violations under the Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments, the only viable claim based on this court's interpretation of the complaint is under the First Amendment for retaliation.

III. Facts FN4

<u>FN4.</u> The facts are taken from the defendants' statement of undisputed material facts since Garrett failed to file a response.

On June 17, 1999, Garrett filed a grievance against

Officer Kelley for verbal harassment. FN5 This grievance was denied by the Central Office Review Committee (CORC) on July 21, 1999. On March 19, 2000, Garrett filed a grievance claiming that defendant Burge used intimidation tactics. Defendant Reynolds investigated the grievance and it was denied based on a finding that no harassment occurred. Garrett appealed to the CORC and they denied the grievance on April 5, 2000. On April 10, 2000, defendant Centore wrote a misbehavior report against Garrett for creating a disturbance and employee harassment. On April 12, 2000, Lieutenant Manell presided over Garrett's Tier 2 disciplinary hearing and he was found guilty of both charges. He was given a 21 day recreation penalty, and loss of packages and commissary. However, his recreation penalty was suspended and deferred. Garrett appealed the determination and it was affirmed on April 19, 2000.

FN5. Not a party in this suit.

On April 17, 2000, Garrett filed a grievance against Centore for harassment. Burge denied his grievance on May 4, 2000, and subsequently, the CORC denied it. On May 12, 2000, Garrett sent a letter to Burge concerning further harassment by Centore. On May 16, 2000, Garrett filed another grievance against Centore for harassment. His grievance was denied on May 26, 2000. After Garrett appealed, his grievance was again denied by the CORC. On June 22, 2000, the Superintendent's Office received a letter from Garrett alleging that Centore threw a piece of paper with a picture of a plunger and the words "always gets the job done" into his cell. He wrote a grievance against Centore for harassment due to the paper that he threw into his cell. Burge forwarded the grievance to the CORC on August 10, 2000. The CORC accepted the grievance on August 30, 2000, in order to investigate.

*2 On June 23, 2000, the Inspector General's Office interviewed Garrett at the Mohawk Correctional Facility regarding his complaints of Centore. That same day, Captain Naughton filed an administrative segregation recommendation. On June 29, 2000, an administrative segregation hearing was held. On July 14, 2000, Garrett was transferred FN6 to the Mid-State Correctional Facility.

FN6. The defendants suggest that Garrett has

failed to exhaust his administrative remedies concerning his transfer. They claim that he agreed to the transfer and participated in the administrative hearing which resulted in his transfer. The issue of transfer will not be addressed in this Report-Recommendation because the court has insufficient information to determine whether he exhausted his remedies.

Finally, Garrett filed a claim alleging that his property was lost or damaged on October 8, 1999. However, he was paid \$75.00 for this claim and he signed a release on December 13, 1999.

IV. Discussion

A. Legal Standard

Summary judgment shall be granted "if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits ... show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1986); accord F.D.I.C. v. Giammettei, 34 F.3d 51, 54 (2d Cir.1994). The moving party has the burden of demonstrating that there is no genuine issue of material fact. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986); Thomas v. Roach, 165 F.3d 137, 142 (2d Cir.1999). "When a motion for summary judgment is made and supported ... an adverse party may not rest upon the mere allegations or denials of the ... pleading, but the adverse party's response, by affidavits or as otherwise provided in [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(e)], must set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial." St. Pierre v. Dyer, 208 F.3d 394, 404 (2d Cir.2000). "[T]he mere existence of some alleged factual dispute between the parties will not defeat an otherwise properly supported motion for summary judgment[.]" Rexford Holdings, Inc. v. Biderman, 21 F.3d 522, 525 (2d Cir.1994)(alternation in original) (citation omitted). However, it is well settled that on a motion for summary judgment, the court must construe the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Tenenbaum v. Williams, 193 F.3d 581, 593 (2d Cir.1999).

Furthermore, in a *pro se* case, the court must view the submissions by a more lenient standard than that accorded

to "formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); see Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976); Burgos v. Hopkins, 14 F.3d 787, 790 (2d Cir.1994)(a court is to read a pro se party's "supporting papers liberally, and ... interpret them to raise the strongest arguments that they suggest"). Indeed, the Second Circuit has stated that "[i]mplicit in the right to self-representation is an obligation on the part of the court to make reasonable allowances to protect pro se litigants from inadvertent forfeiture of important rights because of their lack of legal training." Traguth v. Zuck, 710 F.2d 90, 95 (2d Cir.1983). Any ambiguities and inferences drawn from the facts must be viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Thompson v. Gjivoje, 896 F.2d 716, 720 (2d Cir.1990); see LaFond v. General Physics Serv. Corp., 50 F.3d 165, 171 (2d Cir.1995).

*3 This liberal standard, however, does not excuse a pro se litigant from following the procedural formalities of summary judgment. Showers v. Eastmond, 00 CIV. 3725, 2001 WL 527484, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 16, 2001). More specifically, Local Rule 7.1(a)(3) of this court specifically provides that "any facts set forth in the [moving party's] Statement of Material Facts shall be deemed admitted unless specifically controverted by the opposing party." Local Rule 7.1(a)(3) further requires that the "non-movant shall file a Statement of Material Fact which mirrors the movant's statement in matching numbered paragraphs and which set forth a specific reference to the record where the material fact is alleged to arise." The courts of the Northern District have adhered to a strict application of Local Rule 7.1(a)(3)'s requirement on summary judgment motions. Giguere v. Racicot, 00-CV-1178, 2002 WL 368534, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. March 1, 2002)(interalia citing Bundy Am. Corp. v. K-Z Rental Leasing, Inc., 00-CV-260, 2001 WL 237218, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. March 9, 2001)).

Furthermore, this Circuit adheres to the view that nothing in Rule 56 imposes an obligation on the court to conduct a search and independent review of the record to find proof of a factual dispute. Amnesty America v. Town of West Hartford, 288 F.3d 467, 470 (2d Cir.2002). As long as the local rules impose a requirement that parties provide specific record citations in support of their statement of material facts, the court may grant summary judgment on that basis. Id. at 470-71.

In this case, Garrett did not file a response to the motion for summary judgment. Consequently, this court will accept the properly supported facts contained in the defendants' 7.1 Statement (*Dkt. No. 49*) as true for purposes of this motion. FN7 With this standard in mind, the court now turns to the sufficiency of Garrett's claims.

<u>FN7.</u> The court notes that this does not apply to the various conclusions of law contained in the defendants' 7.1 Statement.

B. Eleventh Amendment

In Garrett's complaint, he raises claims against the defendants in their official and individual capacity. The Eleventh Amendment provides that: "[t]he judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State." U.S. Const. Amend. XI. Although the Amendment does not specifically prohibit suits against a state by its own citizens, the Supreme Court has consistently applied that immunity to such cases. See Burnette v. Carothers, 192 F.3d 52, 57 (2d Cir.1999)(citing Edelman v. Jordan, 415 U.S. 651, 662-63 (1974)). Moreover, it is well established that Eleventh Amendment immunity applies not only when a state is a named defendant, but when liability must be paid from state coffers. See New York City Health & Hosp. Corp. v. Perales, 50 F.3d 129, 134 (2d Cir.1995)(citing Edelman, 415 U .S. at 665); Dawkins v. State of New York, 93-CV-1298, 1996 WL 156764, at *2 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 28, 1996).

*4 In this case, Garrett raises claims against the defendants in their official and individual capacities. Since the Eleventh Amendment bars official capacity claims against these state officers, this court recommends dismissal of Garrett's claims against the defendants in their official capacity.

C. Retaliation

In this case, Garrett claims that during the course of his appointment as an IGRC representative, he has been subjected to repeated acts of harassment, both verbal and

physical, threatened with physical assaults, placed into disciplinary confinement in the SHU, and transferred. FN8
The Second Circuit has held that retaliation against a prisoner for pursuing a grievance is actionable under § 1983. Graham v. Henderson, 89 F.3d 75, 80 (2d Cir.1996). Moreover, the Second Circuit has recognized both the near inevitability of decisions and actions by prison officials to which prisoners will take exception and the ease with which claims of retaliation may be fabricated. Thus, prisoners' claims of retaliation are examined with skepticism and particular care. See Flaherty v. Coughlin, 713 F.2d 10 (2d Cir.1983).

FN8. This case turns on the interpretation of the complaint. Garret's complaint is not a model of clarity and as noted, he has failed to file a response to the motion for summary judgment. Nonetheless, a careful reading of Garrett's opening paragraph under the title "Facts" compels this court to interpret this complaint as one claiming retaliation for his activities and status as an IGRC representative.

In order for a plaintiff to prevail on a First Amendment retaliation claim, a plaintiff must advance non-conclusory allegations establishing: (1) that the speech or conduct at issue was protected; (2) that the defendant took adverse action against the plaintiff; and, (3) that there was a causal connection between the protected speech and the adverse action. See Dawes v. Walker, FN9 239 F.3d 489, 492 (2d Cir.2001) (citation omitted) overruled on other grounds, Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506 (2002). If Garrett makes these showings, DOCS may evade liability if it demonstrates that it would have disciplined or transferred him "'even in the absence of the protected conduct." Bennett v. Goord, 343 F.3d 133, 137 (2d Cir.2003) (citations omitted).

<u>FN9.</u> Dawes' complaint was dismissed pursuant to <u>Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6)</u>.

An inmate has a constitutional right to be protected from retaliation based upon his activities as an IGRC representative. *Alnutt v. Cleary*, 913 F.Supp. 160, 170 (W.D.N.Y.1996). However, a claim brought under "42 U.S.C. § 1983 is not designed to rectify harassment or verbal abuse." *Gill v. Hoadley*, 261 F.Supp 2d 113, 129

(N.D.N.Y.2003)(citing Alnutt, 913 F.Supp at 165-66)). Ordinarily, a claim for verbal harassment is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Aziz Zarif Shabazz v. Picco, 994 F.Supp. 460, 474 (S.D.N.Y.1998). Moreover, "verbal harassment or profanity alone, unaccompanied by an injury no matter how inappropriate, unprofessional, or reprehensible it might seem, does not constitute the violation of any federally protected right and therefore is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983." Aziz Zarif Shabazz, 994 F.Supp. at 474.

In this case, Garrett claims that defendant Centore harassed him for his activities as an IGRC representative. Garrett also claims that he was removed as an IGRC representative when he was transferred. In addition, Garrett claims that defendants Reynolds, Mance, Burger and Maher failed to properly investigate his allegations against Centore. Garrett claims that these defendants failed to properly investigate his claims in retaliation for his activities as an IGRC representative.

*5 More specifically, Garrett claims that Reynolds and Mance recalled IGRC passes for one day in order to interfere with an investigation inquiry into a correctional officer's conduct involving inmates who were left in the yard during inclement weather. Finally, Garrett claims that his property was destroyed while he was in the SHU. FN10 Garrett filed grievances against Centore in April, May, and June of 2000. One of his complaints involved Centore throwing a folded piece of paper into his cell which had a picture of a plunger with the words "always gets the job done" on it. On June 23, 2000, he was placed in administrative segregation in the SHU. Three weeks later he was transferred. FN11

<u>FN10.</u> However, the defendants provide the court with documents which show that he was paid \$75.00 in settlement of this claim.

FN11. The defendants maintain that Garrett failed to exhaust this claim. At this juncture, it is unclear whether or not he exhausted this claim. As such, this court cannot, as a matter of law, recommend dismissal because the court has insufficient information to determine this issue.

Viewing the facts in the light most favorable to Garrett, the non-moving party, this court cannot, as a matter of law, find that Garrett fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted. He claims that he was retaliated against for his activities as an IGRC representative. As noted, verbal harassment alone will not constitute a violation of a prisoner's constitutional rights but in this case, it appears that he was transferred for his activities as an IGRC representative. The defendants rely on numerous grievances which were denied by the CORC to show that their actions were proper. They also claim that Garrett has failed to show injury, however, at this juncture of the litigation with virtually no discovery in this case, this court cannot recommend dismissal as a matter of law.

D. Personal Involvement

It is well settled in this Circuit that personal involvement of defendants in alleged constitutional deprivations is a prerequisite to an award of damages under § 1983. Colon v. Coughlin, 58 F.3d 865, 873 (2d Cir.1995)(citation omitted). Since there is no respondeat superior liability, the defendant must be shown to have personal involvement in the alleged deprivation of rights. Al- Jundi v. Estate of Rockefeller, 885 F.2d 1060, 1065 (2d Cir.1989). Supervisory officials cannot be held liable under § 1983 solely for the acts of their subordinates. See Monell v. Department of Social Serv., 436 U.S. 658, 690-695 (2d Cir.1978). However, a supervisory official can be held liable for constitutional violations if he or she: (1) directly participated in the violation; (2) failed to remedy the violation after learning of it through a report or appeal; (3) created a custom or policy fostering the violation after learning of it; or (4) was grossly negligent in supervising subordinates who caused the violation. Sealey v. Giltner, 116 F.3d 47, 51 (2d Cir.1997) (citing Williams v. Smith, 781 F.2d 319, 323-24 (2d Cir.1986)).

Garrett contends that defendants Reynolds and Mance allowed staff members under their supervision to violate his rights. More specifically, Mance refused to properly investigate Garrett's complaints. Garrett also claims that defendant Burge refused to grant his request for redress against defendant Centore. Finally, Garrett claims that the defendants collectively failed to properly train and supervise their employees.

*6 The defendants contend that the claims against the supervisory defendants should be dismissed for lack of personal involvement. However, this court finds this contention without merit since it appears that all of the defendants were involved in the investigation process of Garrett's complaint and he accuses all of them of continuing the alleged constitutional violation by failing to properly investigate the grievances he filed. Accordingly, this court recommends denying the defendants' motion for summary judgment based on the lack of personal involvement.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, it is hereby

RECOMMENDED, that Garrett's claims against the defendants in their official capacity under the Eleventh Amendment should be dismissed since these claims are barred; and it is further

RECOMMENDED, that defendant O'Reilly be dismissed since he was never served; and it is further

RECOMMENDED, that the defendants' motion for summary judgment be denied in all other respects; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the Court serve a copy of this Report-Recommendation upon the parties by regular mail.

NOTICE: Pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>636(b)(1)</u>, the parties may lodge written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court within TEN days. FAILURE TO SO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. *Roldan v. Racette*, <u>984 F.2d 85 (2d Cir.1993)</u>; 28 U.S.C. § <u>636(b)(1)</u>; Fed.R.Civ.P. 72, 6(a), 6(e).

N.D.N.Y.,2003.

Garrett v. Reynolds Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2003 WL 22299359 (N.D.N.Y.) END OF DOCUMENT Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2003 WL 22299359 (N.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2003 WL 22299359 (N.D.N.Y.))



Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2011 WL 5080404 (N.D.N.Y.)

(Cite as: 2011 WL 5080404 (N.D.N.Y.))

н

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,

N.D. New York.
Jason A. KETCHUCK, Plaintiff,
v.
Brad A. BOYER, Defendant.
No. 3:10-CV-870 (TJM / DEP).

Oct. 25, 2011.

Jason A. Ketchuck, Endicott, NY, pro se.

Roger W. Kinsey, Office of Attorney General, Albany, NY, for Defendant.

DECISION & ORDER

THOMAS J. McAVOY, Senior District Judge.

I. INTRODUCTION

*1 Plaintiff Jason A. Ketchuck commenced this action pro se asserting claims of false arrest, malicious prosecution, and abuse of process pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See Compl., dkt. #1. Defendant moves for summary judgment seeking to dismiss the action in its entirety. See Motion, dkt. #15. In opposition, Plaintiff filed only affidavits from himself and his father. See Opp., dkt. #18. FNI Defendant has filed a reply. See Reply, dkt. #19. The Court has determined to decide the motion based upon the submissions alone. See N.D.N.Y.L.R. 7.1(h) ("In the district court judge's discretion ..., the district court judge may dispose of a motion without oral argument. Thus, the parties should be prepared to have their motion papers serve as the sole method of argument on the motion.").

FN1. Plaintiff was served with the Northern District's standard summary judgment notification for *pro se* litigants, *see* dkt. # 15–1. This notification provided, *inter alia*,

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1 of the Northern District of New York, you are required to

submit the following papers in opposition to this motion: (I) a memorandum of law (containing relevant factual and legal argument); (ii) one or more affidavits in opposition to the motion and (iii) a short and concise statement of material facts as to which you claim there are genuine issues in dispute. These papers must be filed and served in accordance with the time set by Local Rule 7.1.

If you do not submit a short and concise statement of material facts as to which you claim there are genuine issues in dispute, all material facts set forth in the statement filed and served by the defendant(s) shall be deemed admitted.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Court may grant summary judgment where "there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." FED. R. CIV. P. 56(a). A dispute is genuine if the relevant evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986). A party seeking summary judgment bears the burden of informing the court of the basis for the motion and of identifying those portions of the record that the moving party believes demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact as to a dispositive issue. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323, 106 S.Ct. 2548, 91 L.Ed.2d 265 (1986).

If the movant is able to establish a *prima facie* basis for summary judgment, the burden of production shifts to the party opposing summary judgment who must produce evidence establishing the existence of a factual dispute that a reasonable jury could resolve in his favor. *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986). The nonmoving party must show, by affidavits or other evidence, admissible in form, that there are specific factual

issues that can only be resolved at trial. <u>Colon v. Coughlin, 58 F.3d 865, 872 (2d Cir.1995)</u>. "[P]roceeding pro se does not otherwise relieve a litigant from the usual requirements of summary judgment." <u>Viscusi v. Proctor & Gamble, 2007 WL 2071546</u>, at * 9 (E.D.N.Y. July 16, 2007).

In determining whether to grant summary judgment, the Court must view all facts in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, but "only if there is a 'genuine' dispute as to those facts." Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 127 S.Ct. 1769, 1776, 167 L.Ed.2d 686 (2007). The nonmoving party cannot defeat summary judgment by "simply show[ing] that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts," Matsushita., 475 U.S. at 586, or by a factual argument based on "conjecture or surmise." Bryant v. Maffucci, 923 F.2d 979, 982 (2d Cir.1991). In this regard, a party opposing a properly supported motion for summary judgment may not rest upon "mere allegations or denials" asserted in the pleadings, Rexnord Holdings, Inc. v. Bidermann, 21 F.3d 522, 525-26 (2d Cir. 1994), or on conclusory allegations or unsubstantiated speculation. Scotto v. Almenas, 143 F.3d 105, 114 (2d Cir.1998).

*2 The Local Rules of the Northern District require a party moving for summary judgment to submit a "Statement of Material Facts" which sets forth, with citations to the record, each material fact about which the moving party contends there exists no genuine issue. N.D.N.Y.L.R. 7.1(a)(3). Once a properly supported Local Rule 7.1(a)(3) Statement is submitted, the party opposing the motion must

file a response to the [movant's] Statement of Material Facts. The non-movant's response shall mirror the movant's Statement of Material Facts by admitting and/or denying each of the movant's assertions in matching numbered paragraphs. Each denial shall set forth a specific citation to the record where the factual issue arises. The non-movant's response may also set forth any additional material facts that the non-movant contends are in dispute in separately numbered paragraphs. Any facts set forth in the Statement of Material Facts shall be deemed admitted unless specifically controverted by the opposing party.

Id. (underscoring in original).

The responding Statement of Material Facts is not a mere formality, and the courts apply this rule strictly. See N.Y. Teamsters Conference Pension & Ret. Fund v. Express Servs., Inc., 426 F.3d 640, 648–49 (2d Cir.2005) (upholding grant of summary judgment where "[t]he district court, applying Rule 7.1(a)(3) strictly, reasonably deemed [movant's] statement of facts to be admitted" because the non-movant submitted a responsive Rule 7.1(a) (3) statement that "offered mostly conclusory denials of [movant's] factual assertions and failed to include any record citations."); Gubitosi v. Kapica, 154 F.3d 30, 31 n. 1 (2d Cir.1998) (per curiam) (accepting as true material facts contained in unopposed local rule statement of material facts); Meaney v. CHS Acquisition Corp., 103 F.Supp.2d 104, 108 (N.D.N.Y.2000) (deeming movant's Rule 7.1(a)(3) Statement admitted where non-movant's response "set forth no citations—specific or otherwise—to the record") (emphasis in original); McKnight v. Dormitory Auth. of State of N.Y., 189 F.R.D. 225, 227 (N.D.N.Y.1999) (McAvoy, J.) ("deem[ing] the portions of Defendants' 7.1(a)(3) statement that are not specifically controverted by Plaintiff to be admitted"); Osier v. Broome County, 47 F.Supp.2d 311, 317 (N.D.N.Y.1999) (McAvoy, J.) (deeming admitted all facts in defendants' Rule 7.1(a) (3) statement where "plaintiff submitted thirteen pages of purported facts without any indication where those facts can be located in the record").

While the Court must construe a pro se litigant's pleadings and papers liberally and interpret them to raise the strongest arguments that they suggest, Govan v. Campbell, 289 F.Supp.2d 289, 295 (N.D.N.Y.2003); FN2 Veloz v. New York, 339 F.Supp.2d 505, 513 (S.D.N.Y.2004), the application of this lenient standard does not relieve a pro se litigant of the requirement to follow the procedural formalities of Local Rule 7.1(a)(3). Govan, 289 F.Supp.2d at 295; see also Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S.Ct. 2525, 2541 n. 46, 45 L.Ed.2d 562 (1975) ("The right of self-representation is not a license ... not to comply with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law."); Edwards v. INS, 59 F.3d 5, 8 (2nd Cir.1995) ("While a pro se litigant's pleadings must be construed liberally, ... pro se litigants

generally are required to inform themselves regarding procedural rules and to comply with them.").

FN2. To construe pleadings liberally means the Court must view the submissions by a more lenient standard than that accorded to "formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." *Govan*, 289 F.Supp.2d at 295.

III. BACKGROUND

*3 Because Plaintiff has not submitted an opposing Statement of Material Facts, the properly supported facts set forth in Defendant's Statement of Material Facts are deemed admitted for purposes of this motion. N.D.N.Y.L.R. 7.1(a)(3). Except where indicated otherwise, the following facts are taken from Defendant's Statement of Material Facts.

Defendant Brad A. Boyer is a uniformed New York State Trooper assigned to the Owego Barracks of Troop C of the New York State Police, headquartered in Sidney, New York. On October 22, 2008, he responded to a call from an individual named Carol A Smith who complained that Plaintiff Jason Ketchuck, one of the sons of her next door neighbor, had repeatedly driven his vehicle through her yard, and that the most recent occasion on which this had occurred was at approximately 7:38 AM on October 22, 2008. She complained that this course of conduct had caused rutting and damage to her front lawn.

Upon responding to the call, Trooper Boyer observed the rutting and damage to Ms. Smith's lawn alongside the roadway in front of her house, and took a series of photographs of the lawn. Trooper Boyer took a sworn statement from Ms. Smith on October 22, 2008, and she signed a Complaint against Jason A. Ketchuck on the same date accusing him of Trespass, in violation of New York Penal Law § 140.05. Based upon the information provided by Ms. Smith and the property damage that he observed and photographed on October 22, 2008, Trooper Boyer also prepared and signed an Information charging Jason A. Ketchuck with Criminal Mischief in the Fourth Degree.

On October 31, 2008, Trooper Boyer requested that Plaintiff come to the Owego Barracks to meet with him

concerning Ms. Smith's complaint, which he did. Mr. Ketchuck admitted that he had been the driver of the small grey car on the date and time that had been the subject of Ms. Smith's complaint; however, he denied that he had driven the car on her lawn. Mr. Ketchuck also contended that the ruts near the road were on property that was abandoned by the Town of Owego in 1934 and that, although Ms. Smith "extended the landscaping of her property onto the abandoned road without the Town's permission" seven (7) years prior, his father was claiming ownership of this property in a quite title action in New York State Supreme Court. Jason Ketchuck Aff., ¶ 9; see James Ketchuck Aff., ¶¶ 2, 8. Ketchuck's father also contends that, prior to charges being levied against his son, he met with Trooper Boyer and attempted to show Trooper Boyer "property maps, surveys, deeds, and town records which set forth the property lines and boundaries of the property owned by [Ms.] Smith," but Trooper Boyer "refused to look at them." James Ketchuck Aff., ¶¶ 6-7.

Trooper Boyer issued Plaintiff an appearance ticket charging him with Trespass in violation of Penal Law § 140.05 and Criminal Mischief in the Fourth Degree in violation of Penal Law § 145. After issuing the appearance ticket to Jason A. Ketchuck on October 31, 2008, Trooper Boyer did not have any further involvement in the prosecution of this case. The charges were Dismissed in the Interest of Justice in the Owego Town Court on May 27, 2009.

IV. DISCUSSION

a. False Arrest

*4 Plaintiff claims that he was falsely arrested by Defendant. A false arrest claim, whether brought under federal or state law, FN3 will fail if, at the time of the seizure, the arresting officer had probable cause to make an arrest. Jocks v. Tavernier, 316 F.3d 128, 135 (2d Cir.2003); Smith v. Edwards, 175 F.3d 99, 105 (2d Cir.1999); Weyant v. Okst, 101 F.3d 845, 852 (2d Cir.1996); see Jaegly v. Couch, 439 F.3d 149, 152 (2d Cir.2006) ("Under New York law, the existence of probable cause is an absolute defense to a false arrest claim."). "Whether probable cause exists depends upon the reasonable conclusion to be drawn from the facts

known to the arresting officer at the time of the arrest." <u>Devenpeck v. Alford</u>, 543 U.S. 146, 125 S.Ct. 588, 593, 160 L.Ed.2d 537 (2004) (citing <u>Maryland v. Pringle</u>, 540 U.S. 366, 371, 124 S.Ct. 795, 157 L.Ed.2d 769 (2003)).

FN3. Plaintiff asserts claims only under federal law pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. However, given Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court examines the potential supplemental state law claims that might be asserted.

"Probable cause exists if at the time of the arrest 'the facts and circumstances within th[e officer's] knowledge and of which [he] had reasonably trustworthy information were sufficient to warrant a prudent man in believing that the [suspect] had committed or was committing an offense.' " Amore v. Novarro, 624 F.3d 522, 536 (2d Cir.2010 (citing Beck v. Ohio, 379 U.S. 89, 91, 85 S.Ct. 223, 13 L.Ed.2d 142 (1964)); see Posr v. Court Officer Shield No. 207, 180 F.3d 409, 414 (2d Cir.1999). The relevant inquiry is whether "probable cause existed to arrest a defendant" and "it is not relevant whether probable cause existed with respect to each individual charge, or, indeed, any charge actually invoked by the arresting officer at the time of arrest." Jaegly, 439 F.3d at 154; see Devenpeck v. Alford, 543 U.S. 146, 125 S.Ct. 588, 160 L.Ed.2d 537 (2004) (probable cause to arrest can exist even if offense relied upon is not even "closely related" to offense charged). "A probable cause determination does not require proof beyond a reasonable doubt; it is the mere probability of criminal activity, based on the totality of the circumstances, that satisfies the Fourth Amendment." Hahn v. County of Otsego, 820 F.Supp. 54, 55 (N.D.N.Y.1993), aff'd, 52 F.3d 310 (2d Cir.1995). "[T]he eventual disposition of the criminal charges is irrelevant to the probable cause determination." Hahn, 820 F.Supp. at 55 (citing Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547, 555, 87 S.Ct. 1213, 18 L.Ed.2d 288 (1967)).

"It is well-established that a law enforcement official has probable cause to arrest if he received his information from some person, normally the putative victim or eyewitness." <u>Martinez v. Simonetti</u>, 202 F.3d 625, 634 (2d Cir.2000) (quoting <u>Miroslavsky v. AES Eng'g Soc'y</u>, 808 F.Supp. 351, 355 (S.D.N.Y.1992), aff'd 993 F.2d 1534 (2d Cir.1993)). "If policemen arrest a person on the basis

of a private citizen's complaint that if true would justify the arrest, and they reasonably believe it is true, they cannot be held liable ... merely because it later turns out that the complaint was unfounded." Lee v. Sandberg, 136 F.3d 94, 103 (2d Cir.1997); see Calderola v. Calabrese, 298 F.3d 156, 165 (2d Cir.2002) ("[W]hen an average citizen tenders information to the police, the police should be permitted to assume that they are dealing with a credible person in the absence of special circumstances suggesting that might not be the case."). Once a police officer has probable cause, he need not explore "every theoretically plausible claim of innocence before making an arrest." Ricciuti v. New York City Transit Authority, 124 F.3d 123, 128 (2d Cir.1997); see Coons v. Casabella, 284 F.3d 437, 441 (2d Cir.2002) ("[P]olice officers are not required to explore and eliminate every theoretically plausible claim of innocence before making an arrest."); Hotaling v. LaPlante, 67 F.Supp.2d 517, 522 (N.D.N.Y.2001) (valid probable cause to arrest rested upon information supplied by an identified witness, and even though a further investigation by the Trooper would have led to a contradictory conclusion, Trooper's conduct was not unreasonable under the circumstances).

*5 Where the facts surrounding the arrest are uncontroverted, the determination as to whether probable cause existed may be made by the Court as a matter of law. Weyant v. Okst. 101 F.3d 845, 852 (2d Cir.1996). Even where factual disputes exist, a § 1983 claim may fail if the plaintiff's version of events is sufficient to establish probable cause to arrest. Mistretta v. Prokesch, 5 F.Supp.2d 128, 133 (E.D.N.Y.1998).

Here, the alleged victim provided Defendant with a sworn statement that Plaintiff repeatedly drove his vehicle over a portion of her lawn causing damage to it. The victim's statement was corroborated by the tire marks and the ruts in the lawn which Defendant observed and photographed; and by Plaintiff's admission that he was the driver of the car alleged to have caused damage to the lawn. These facts provided more than ample probable cause for Defendant to believe that Plaintiff committed the offense of Trespass under Section 140.05 of the New York Penal Law. FNA In this regard, the facts provided probable cause to believe that Plaintiff had intentionally driven his car across Ms. Smith's lawn on October 22, 2008; that she

did not consent to his doing so; and that Plaintiff's conduct on his neighbor's property, which had caused observable damage to the lawn, was not conduct that Plaintiff was licensed or privileged to engage in. See Caidor v. Harrington, 2009 WL 174958 (N.D.N.Y.2009) (Suddaby, J.) (granting summary judgment dismissing § 1983 false arrest claim based on arrest for violation of P.L. § 140.05). Moreover, these same facts provided ample probable cause to believe that Plaintiff had committed the offense of Criminal Mischief in the Fourth Degree in violation of N.Y. Penal Law § 145 FNS in that the facts, including the allegation that Plaintiff's car was repeatedly driven on the lawn, provided probable cause to believe that Plaintiff intentionally damaged Ms. Smith's property by driving his car on it.

FN4. Section 140.05 of New York Penal Law provides that "[a] person is guilty of trespass when he knowingly enters or remains unlawfully in or upon premises. Trespass is a violation." "Premises" is defined to include any "building" or "real property." Penal Law 140.00(1). Penal Law § 140.00(5) provides that a person "enters or remain(s) unlawfully upon premises when he is not licensed or privileged to do so."

FN5. In relevant part, Penal Law § 145 provides:

A person is guilty of criminal mischief in the fourth degree when, having no right to do so nor any reasonable ground to believe that he or she has such right, he or she:

1. Intentionally damages property of another person[.]

"While no statutory definition of 'damages' is provided, it is commonly recognized that the term contemplates 'injury or harm to property that lowers its value or involves loss of efficiency' and that only 'slight' damage must be proved" to establish a violation of Penal Law § 145. <u>People v. Collins</u>, 288 A.D.2d 756, 758, 733 N.Y.S.2d 289 (3d Dept.2001).

Because a police officer need not explore every

theoretically plausible claim of innocence before making an arrest, and because the existence of probable cause is determined by a standard far less burdensome than determining guilt, Defendant's probable cause determination is not negatively affected by Plaintiff's assertion of innocence or by Defendant's failure to review the property maps or surveys. FN6 A police officer is not required to conduct an investigation if the facts demonstrate that probable cause exists that an offense has been committed. Accordingly, Defendant was not required to conduct independent research into who actually owned the property claimed by Ms. Smith as her front lawn before issuing the appearance ticket. This is especially so in light of the undisputed facts that the tire marks were on property abutting Ms. Smith's front lawn and on a piece of property over which Ms. Smith purportedly "extended the landscaping of her property" some seven (7) years prior to the incident. These facts provided reasonable corroboration for Ms. Smith's sworn statement that the tire marks and ruts were on her property.

FN6. Defendant denies that the purported property dispute regarding the subject portion of Ms. Smith's front yard was ever articulated to him. Regardless, even if a property dispute regarding the subject property was articulated to Defendant, he was not required to a perform a title search or make additional inquiry to resolve the dispute in light of the sworn statement by Ms. Smith that the property in question belonged to her.

*6 Even assuming, arguendo, that actual probable cause did not exist such to satisfy the demands of the Fourth Amendment, arguable probable cause existed such to entitle Defendant to qualified immunity. See Zellner v. Summerlin, 494 F.3d 344, 369-70 (2d Cir.2007) (discussing "arguable probable cause" as basis for qualified immunity). Arguable probable cause exists if either (a) it was objectively reasonable for the officer to believe that probable cause existed, or (b) officers of reasonable competence could disagree on whether the probable cause test was met." Amore, 624 F.3d at 536 (citing Walczyk v. Rio, 496 F.3d 139, 163 (2d Cir.2007)). To determine whether an officer had arguable probable cause, the objective information he possessed at the time

of the arrest is examined, not the "subjective intent, motives or beliefs" of the officer. Id. Here, the information Defendant possessed at the time he issued the appearance ticket provided an objectively reasonable basis for him to believe that probable cause existed for the two offenses with which Plaintiff was charged. Accordingly, Defendant is entitled to qualified immunity on the false arrest claim because it was objectively reasonable for him to believe that his acts did not violate Plaintiff's clearly established rights under the Fourth Amendment. Id. at 530 ([Q]ualified immunity ... is sufficient to shield executive employees from civil liability under § 1983 if either (1) their conduct did not violate clearly established rights of which a reasonable person would have known, or (2) it was objectively reasonable [for them] to believe that their acts did not violate these clearly established rights."). For these reasons, the false arrest claim is dismissed.

b. Malicious Prosecution

Based on the undisputed facts that supplied Defendant with actual probable cause to believe that Plaintiff committed the two offenses for which he was charged, the malicious prosecution claim also fails as a matter of law. See Rohman v. New York City Transit Auth., 215 F.3d 208, 215 (2d Cir.2000) (an element of a malicious prosecution claim is that the defendant lacked probable cause to believe the proceeding could succeed).

Moreover, to state a claim for malicious prosecution under either § 1983 or New York state common law, Plaintiff must establish, inter alia, "termination of the proceeding in [the accused's] favor." Green v. Mattingly, 585 F.3d 97, 104 (2d Cir.2009). Whether termination is deemed favorable to the accused is determined in accordance with applicable state law, here, New York law. Hygh v. Jacobs, 961 F.2d 359, 367 (2d Cir.1992). Proceedings are "terminated in favor of the accused" when their final disposition is such as to indicate the accused is not guilty. DiBlasio v. City of New York, 102 F.3d 654, 657 (2d Cir.1996). "Where a prosecution did not result in an acquittal, it is generally not deemed to have ended in favor of the accused, for purposes of a malicious prosecution claim, unless its final disposition is such as to indicate the accused's innocence." Fulton v. Robinson, 289 F.3d 188, 196 (2d Cir.2002). A dismissal "in the interest of justice" under New York Criminal Procedure Law § 170.40 "cannot provide the favorable termination required

as the basis for a claim of malicious prosecution." <u>Hygh, 961 F.2d at 368</u> (citing <u>Ryan v. N.Y. Tel. Co., 62 N.Y.2d 494, 478 N.Y.S.2d 823, 467 N.E.2d 487, 493 (1984)</u>). Thus, Plaintiff cannot establish the "favorable termination" element of his malicious prosecution claim.

*7 Further, the undisputed facts are that Trooper Boyer never had any prior contact with either Mr. Ketchuck or Ms. Smith before this incident. He attested that he harbored no improper motive in instituting the charges, and that he issued the appearance ticket and filed the accusatory instruments in the Town Court only because of his good faith belief that there was the probable cause to pursue such charges. See Boyer Aff. ¶¶ 11, 13. There are no facts from which a reasonable fact finder could conclude that Trooper Boyer instituted the underlying proceeding with a malicious motive or intent such to state a viable malicious prosecution claim. See Manganiello v. City of New York, 612 F.3d 149, 161 (2d Cir.2010) (to prevail on a malicious prosecution claim, a plaintiff must establish, inter alia, that the proceeding was begun with malice); Lowth v. Town of Cheektowaga, 82 F.3d 563, 573 (2d Cir.1996) (malice may be proven by showing that the prosecutor had "a wrong or improper motive, something other than a desire to see the ends of justice served") (internal quotation marks omitted).

Finally, for the reason discussed above with regard to Trooper Boyer's entitlement to qualified immunity on the false arrest charge, he is also entitled to qualified immunity on the malicious prosecution claim. That is, under the circumstances it was objectively reasonable for reasonable officers to believe that there was probable cause to commence the prosecution for the offenses charged. Accordingly, the malicious prosecution claim is dismissed.

c. Abuse of Process

Plaintiff's third claim against Trooper Boyer is for malicious abuse of process in connection with the institution of the Town Court proceeding. "In the criminal context, malicious abuse of process is by definition a denial of procedural due process.... Procedural due process forbids the use of legal process for a wrongful purpose." Abreu v. Romero, 2010 WL 4615879, at *8

(S.D.N.Y. Nov.9, 2010) (citation omitted). To state a claim for the malicious abuse of process, Plaintiff must prove that the Defendant (1) employed regularly issued legal process to compel performance or forbearance of some act, (2) with intent to do harm without excuse or justification (3) in order to obtain a collateral objective that is outside the legitimate ends of the process. Savino v. City of New York, 331 F.3d 63, 76 (2d Cir.2003). "The pursuit of a collateral objective must occur after the process is issued; the mere act of issuing process does not give rise to a claim." Lopez v. City of New York, 901 F.Supp. 684, 691 (S.D.N.Y.1995) (citing PSI Metals v. Firemen's Ins. Co., 839 F.2d 42, 43 (2d Cir.1988)). In other words, Plaintiff "must claim that [Defendant] aimed to achieve a collateral purpose beyond or in addition to his criminal prosecution." Savino, 331 F.3d at 77. "In New York, such wrongful purposes have included economic harm, extortion, blackmail, and retribution." Abreu, 2010 WL 4615879, at *8 (citing Bd. of Educ. of Farmingdale Union Free Sch. Dist. v. Farmingdale Classroom Teachers Ass'n, 38 N.Y.2d 397, 404, 380 N.Y.S.2d 635, 343 N.E.2d 278 (1975)).

*8 Plaintiff's malicious abuse of process claim fails as the facts are devoid of any allegations concerning any "collateral objective" that Defendants may have had in instituting criminal charges against Plaintiff. There is no factual basis upon which a reasonable fact finder could conclude that the issuance of the appearance tickets to Plaintiff was motivated by anything other than Trooper Boyer's good-faith belief that he had probable cause to conclude that Plaintiff had engaged in conduct that constituted trespass and/or criminal mischief. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Trooper Boyer had any involvement in the prosecution of the case against Plaintiff after he issued the appearance tickets on October 31, 2008. Under these uncontested facts, the claim fails as a matter of law.

Finally, and assuming arguendo that a viable malicious prosecution claim existed, Trooper Boyer is entitled to qualified immunity on the claim in that there existed, at the least, arguable probable cause to commence the criminal proceeding. This arguable probable cause provides an objectively reasonable justification for issuing process commencing the underlying proceeding. Cf. Abreu, 2010 WL 4615879, at *8 ("While probable cause

is not an element of an abuse of process claim, under New York law, a showing of probable cause at the time process issued suffices ... to establish excuse or justification for the purposes of a defense to abuse of process.") (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Accordingly, the abuse of process claim is dismissed.

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Defendant's motion for summary judgment [dkt. # 15] is **GRANTED** and all claims in this case are **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

N.D.N.Y.,2011.

Ketchuck v. Boyer Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2011 WL 5080404 (N.D.N.Y.) END OF DOCUMENT